



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2010

No. 15

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

I hereby appoint the Honorable GWEN MOORE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

### FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, the time for fiscal responsibility is now. Unfortunately, budget deficits are not a new phenomenon. We had budget deficits in 74 of the past 100 years. In fiscal year 1969, under Lyndon Johnson, we had a budget surplus of \$3.2 billion. However, each of the next 28 budgets was in deficit. But starting in fiscal year 1998, under President Clinton, we had four straight budget surpluses, totalling more than \$559 billion. In fact, the long term budget outlook predicted \$5.6 trillion in surpluses. The last time we had four consecutive

budget surpluses was in fiscal year 1930.

The Great Recession, which began in 2007, dramatically increased unemployment to a peak of 10.2 percent, a 26-year high. For those fortunate enough to remain employed, the recession led to depressed wages and benefits; growing at just 1.5 percent, the lowest level since 1982. As a result, families suffered and Federal income revenues declined precipitously. In 2009, corporate income revenue declined 55 percent, or \$166 billion, from its 2007 level, and individual income revenues fell 20 percent, or \$230 billion.

In addition to the tremendous toll this recession took on the American public, rising unemployment and stagnant wages added almost \$400 billion to our debt. In fact, total Federal revenues, which historically have represented roughly 20 percent of our gross domestic product declined to 14.8 percent in 2009. Although the recession did not create budget deficits, it exacerbated their severity enormously.

In the face of this budgetary maelstrom, we took decisive action. Last year, the House of Representatives voted to reinstitute a statutory pay-as-you-go piece of legislation. In 1990, Congress enacted that statutory PAYGO rule, and required spending increases and revenue decreases to be offset so as not to increase the deficit. PAYGO was one of the critical tools used to control Federal spending and effectuate eventual budget surpluses.

Unfortunately, in 2002, a Republican Congress and a Republican President, President Bush, failed to reenact PAYGO, and allowed it to expire. The results were predictable and disastrous with respect to the Federal deficit. The expiration of PAYGO conveniently allowed the Bush administration to enact three budget-busting initiatives: tax cuts for the wealthy; a prescription drug plan, prescription part D, unpaid for; and two wars, one in Iraq and Af-

ghanistan, none of these initiatives paid for. These actions dramatically increased spending and reduced revenues, adding \$6.7 trillion to the national debt, and leaving the Federal budget fundamentally unbalanced for the foreseeable future.

Combined with the Great Recession, these actions led to the fiscal year 2009 budget, which began in October of '08, with a deficit of more than \$1 trillion. For the better part of the past decade budget deficits were ignored and fiscally irresponsible behavior reigned supreme. A true commitment to deficit reduction will require further action. And just as the previous surpluses were the result of prolonged fiscal responsibility, we must demonstrate a long term focus. Budgets do not go from significant deficits to surpluses overnight. Therefore, it is critical that we set specific milestones and identifiable budget reduction goals.

The President's new budget reduces deficits to 3.9 percent of the GDP, a more sustainable level. This is a reasonable beginning for the next several years. However, more will be necessary, and our goals should continue to further reduce the deficit over the long term.

President Obama's spending freeze proposal is painful, but itself it is a small, though significant action. It demonstrates a return to fiscal responsibility, and represents \$250 billion in deficit reduction. Additional action, however, will have to be taken. For example, the ever-rising cost of health care not only affects every American family pocketbook, but also is a significant contributor to budget deficits. Today health care costs are 18 percent of our GDP. Without reform, that will rise to a staggering 34 percent by 2040. The House health insurance reform legislation was a first step in controlling these costs, and reduced the budget deficit by \$139 billion over the next decade.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H429

Our efforts already have shown modest success. Although we are still in the throes of a fragile economic recovery, the improving conditions recently resulted in a \$50 billion reduction from the '09 deficit. While we cannot completely grow our way out of deficits, creating conditions for economic growth is critical to deficit reduction, and the President's budget reflects that.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord, pour out on this Nation Your Spirit of understanding, truth and peace. May this Congress prove to be Your fit instrument to foster yet a greater union and assure equal justice for all Your people. We ask this because You have given us Your just commands and reveal Your redeeming love—both now and forever. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### BUDGET THAT SPENDS TOO MUCH, TAXES TOO MUCH AND BORROWS TOO MUCH

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in his State of the Union address last week, the President stepped

up his rhetoric about fiscal responsibility. But just yesterday the President presented a budget reminiscent of last year's that spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much. The reality behind the President's budget proposal is that it more than doubles the debt. It drives up spending to \$3.8 trillion in 2011. It pushes the deficit to a record \$1.6 trillion. It raises taxes by over \$2 trillion through 2020.

During these tough economic times, lawmakers should be tightening our fiscal belts just like families across America are doing with their own budgets. Increasing taxes and spending is not the way to rejuvenate our economy and revitalize small businesses to create jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### PRESIDENT'S OBAMA'S PROPOSED BUDGET

(Mr. LUETKEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year, the people back home in the Ninth District of Missouri have expressed their anger about the way our government and this administration are spending their hard-earned money. They are even angrier today after learning that the next proposed budget comes in at a whopping \$3.8 trillion with a record deficit of \$1.6 trillion. I give the President credit for his idea of a spending freeze, but the problem is that it freezes spending at record levels. It comes in after he has signed spending bills and a failed stimulus that have increased some spending by as much as 84 percent in the last 2 years. And the spending freeze applies to just 13 percent of the budget and doesn't even take effect until next year.

In other words, using good old fashioned Missouri logic, this spending freeze is a lot like trying to close the door after the horse is already out. It just doesn't work. The good folks at home are tired of lip service and fancy speeches about getting spending under control. The people of the Show-Me State want us to show them that we are serious about getting spending under control.

#### THE STATES ARE FIGHTING BACK

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the attack on the Constitution continues. In spite of the will of the people, there are those who still want to force-feed us with government-run health care. The Constitution gives no power to the Feds to nationalize health care. The Feds plan to force Americans to buy health insurance or pay a fine or go to jail, or both. And that plan is unconsti-

tutional. So 34 States are fighting back with legislation to block unconstitutional Federal insurance mandates.

Also, Texas Attorney General Greg Abbott and other AGs are ready to fight the Feds in court over the unconstitutional "Corn Husker Kickback." The Kickback and the "Louisiana Purchase" were secret backroom deals, payoffs, paybacks, and rip-offs that gave special health care favors to these States while discriminating against other States who must pay for these corrupt sweetheart deals.

It seems that business as usual is going on in D.C., and it's hazardous to our health. President Reagan said there are two ways to do some things: "The right way and the way they do things in Washington." And that's just the way it is.

#### NASA AND THE CONSTELLATION PROGRAM

(Mr. GRIFFITH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of NASA and the Constellation Program. I am disappointed that the administration seeks to discontinue manned space exploration. Last week, an administration official was quoted in *The Orlando Sentinel* as saying it was not necessary for us to return to the moon. Language like this is a slap in the face. It's disrespectful for the lives lost, the thousands of hours of research and development that have gone into manned space flight. As we are being challenged internationally by China, Russia and others, this administration is not accepting the challenge as President Kennedy did in the 1960s. This administration is asking us to walk away from this challenge, and we will not do so.

We, the scientists, the American public, deserve to be number one in space exploration. The things that NASA has done for medicine, for regular space flight, for regular airlines, the safety, all that's concerned in our society, has been touched by NASA. The very idea that this administration is lowering the expectations of America as far as manned space flight is concerned is a disgrace and we, in Congress, will reject it.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION IS NOT SERIOUS ABOUT IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget proves once again that the Obama administration is not serious about enforcing our Nation's immigration laws. They found money for 25 new positions in the Secretary of Homeland Security's management office, but there is no funding for a single new immigration detention

bed, no new money to find and deport immigration fugitives or criminal aliens, no additional special agents to investigate workplace immigration violations, and no money to expand the visa security program. The President ought to use immigration enforcement to open up jobs for American workers. Instead, the administration maintains the status quo. Citizens and legal immigrants will be forced to continue to compete with 8 million illegal immigrants for very scarce jobs.

#### AN EMPOWERMENT AGENDA

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is simply trying to do too much at too high a cost to the American people. Thomas Jefferson called for "a wise and frugal government which shall leave men free to regulate their own pursuits of industry, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned." And he was right. Government should be empowering citizens to succeed in our economy, not eroding their freedoms and encouraging dependency.

The American people are fed up with rapidly growing government intruding into their lives. They want us to do something about it. My message is simple: To get America back, we must restore our Founders' principles of empowerment. I'm working on an empowerment agenda and will be here in the weeks to come talking about how we can advance empowerment and reduce entitlement. This has been an empowerment moment, and there will be many more as we watch our administration continue to tax and spend money that we don't have and steal the future of our future generations by leaving them with a legacy of debt.

#### FISCAL YEAR 2011 BUDGET

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, when I look at the President's budget for fiscal year 2011, I think about what Albert Einstein said one time. He said that doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result is the very definition of insanity. Well, after years of runaway Federal spending under both political parties, and after promises by this administration of fiscal discipline and reform, the President's budget more than doubles the debt. It drives spending to a record \$3.8 trillion. It pushes the deficit to a record \$1.6 trillion, and raises taxes by more than \$2 trillion by 2020, during the worst recession in 25 years.

Despite future spending freezes promised and commissions, it doesn't change the fact that, by any measure, this budget is insane. The American people know we can't borrow and spend

and bail our way back to prosperity. They know that deficits and debt threaten our prosperity and our posterity. House Republicans have a better plan, a plan built on hard choices, fiscal responsibility, and entitlement reform. On behalf of our families, on behalf of our economy, we say, let's reject this irresponsible and unsustainable budget, and let's come together around the principles of fiscal responsibility and reform, and let's put our house in order.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

#### JIM KOLBE POST OFFICE

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4495) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 North Taylor Lane in Patagonia, Arizona, as the "Jim Kolbe Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4495

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. JIM KOLBE POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 North Taylor Lane in Patagonia, Arizona, shall be known and designated as the "Jim Kolbe Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Jim Kolbe Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present H.R. 4495 for consideration. This legislation will designate the United States Postal Service facility located at 100

North Taylor Lane in Patagonia, Arizona, as the Jim Kolbe Post Office. Introduced by my colleague, Representative GABRIELLE GIFFORDS of Arizona, on January 21, 2010, and reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on January 27, 2010, by unanimous consent, H.R. 4495 enjoys the support of the entire Arizona House delegation.

Born on June 28, 1942, in Evanston, Illinois, United States Navy veteran and former Congressman Jim Kolbe began his public service and political career serving as a United States Senate page for Barry Goldwater and graduating from the United States Capitol Page School in 1960. In 1976, Kolbe ran for the Arizona State Senate and served three terms in that body. In 1985 Mr. Kolbe was sworn in to Congress, becoming the first Republican to represent southern Arizona in the House. During his 22 years in office, Mr. Kolbe served as the chair of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the House Appropriations Committee for his last 6 years in Congress. For four years, he was chairman of the Treasury, Post Office and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

□ 1415

Mr. Kolbe decided not to run for reelection in 2006 and now serves as a senior Trans-Atlantic Fellow at the German Marshall Fund advising on trade matters. He also serves as an adjunct professor in the College of Business at the University of Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor former Congressman Kolbe through the passage of this resolution and by designating the North Taylor Lane Post Office in honor of Congressman Kolbe. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. I rise today in support of H.R. 4495, designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 North Taylor Lane in Patagonia, Arizona, as the "Jim Kolbe Post Office."

Congressman Kolbe is a former colleague of mine here. We had one term overlapping. I certainly appreciate the chairman's words in support of this bipartisan resolution. He served in the United States Navy and the Naval Reserves before being elected to the State Senate in Arizona and elected to the United States Congress in 1984, and he served very ably on the Appropriations Committee for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs. He was one of this institution's hallowed—well, the big guys in this institution seem to be on the Appropriations Committee. And he was an appropriations subcommittee chair, which, as we all know, actually wields a significant amount of weight, especially when you're running a major portion of the budget, such as foreign operations.

In addition to foreign policy, this Congressman served his constituents

ably. He was committed to constituent service and believed that assisting the hardworking individuals and families of his district was a real, everyday good part of his job and was focused on their first priorities in southern Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, Jim Kolbe served his constituents of Arizona in this country honorably for years, and we support this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOWNS. In closing, again, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Jim Kolbe through the passage of H.R. 4495, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4495.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### HONORING JIMMIE JOHNSON

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 957) honoring Jimmie Johnson, 2009 NASCAR Sprint Cup Champion.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 957

Whereas Jimmie Kenneth Johnson, born in El Cajon, California, and a resident of Charlotte, North Carolina, successfully defended his Sprint Cup Championships from 2006, 2007, and 2008;

Whereas Jimmie Johnson becomes the first driver in NASCAR history to win the Sprint Cup Championship in 4 consecutive seasons, surpassing the previous record of 3 straight by Cale Yarborough;

Whereas Jimmie Johnson's #48 Lowe's Chevrolet is backed by the finest team in motorsports, including Crew Chief Chad Knaus, Team Owner Rick Hendrick, and Car Owner, and racing legend Jeff Gordon;

Whereas Jimmie Johnson's life story is the embodiment of the American dream, rising from humble roots to the pinnacle of his profession;

Whereas Jimmie Johnson and his wife Chandra founded the Jimmie Johnson Foundation to provide assistance to disadvantaged children in pursuit of their dreams;

Whereas Jimmie Johnson, now regarded as perhaps the greatest driver in the sport's history, is universally regarded as humble and gracious, unaffected by the enormity of his achievements; and

Whereas Jimmie Kenneth Johnson's remarkable contributions to NASCAR and the communities of El Cajon, California, and Charlotte, North Carolina: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives honors the historic achievements of

Jimmie Kenneth Johnson and the #48 Lowe's Chevrolet team.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am proud to present House Resolution 957 for consideration.

This resolution honors Jimmie Kenneth Johnson and the No. 48 Lowe's Chevrolet team for winning the NASCAR Sprint Cup Championship in 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009.

H. Res. 957 was introduced by my colleague, Representative PATRICK MCHENRY of North Carolina, on December 8, 2009, and favorably reported out of the House Oversight Committee by a voice vote on January 27, 2010. In addition, H. Res. 957 enjoys the support of more than 60 Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution congratulates Jimmie Johnson for winning a historic fourth consecutive NASCAR Sprint Cup Championship. By winning the 2009 championship, Mr. Johnson becomes the first driver in history to win the Sprint Cup Championship four consecutive times, breaking Cale Yarborough's previous record of three straight championships.

In true American fashion, Mr. Johnson, a native of El Cajon, California, and a resident of Charlotte, North Carolina, rose from humble roots to the pinnacle of the NASCAR world. This year Mr. Johnson accomplished something no other driver in NASCAR history has accomplished. Not only has he won the last four NASCAR Sprint Cup Championships but has done so with unwavering poise, class, and humility.

To put Mr. Johnson's unprecedented achievement in context, only NASCAR legends Lee Petty, Richard Petty, David Pearson, Cale Yarborough, Darrell Waltrip, Dale Earnhardt Sr., and Jeff Gordon have won more than two NASCAR Sprint Cup Championships in their career. Furthermore, Mr. Johnson's most recent NASCAR Sprint Cup series championship ties him with teammate Jeff Gordon on the list of all-time champions.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I failed to take this opportunity to also congratulate all of the people who helped Mr. Johnson, of course, win. Mr. Johnson's success would not have been possible without the help of crew chief

Chad Knaus, team owner Rick Hendrick, and, of course, car owner and racing legend Jeff Gordon, and the countless other team members who helped Mr. Johnson win the last four NASCAR Sprint Cup Championships.

Beyond his impressive accomplishments on the race track, Mr. Johnson has never forgotten his humble beginnings and continues to give back to the community, and I think that is so important.

In 2006, Mr. Johnson and his wife, Chandra, founded the Jimmie Johnson Foundation, which is dedicated to assisting children, families, and communities in need throughout the United States. The foundation helps build places to play and places to live, saves lives through blood collection and adding individuals to the National Bone Marrow Program registry, and helps grant the wishes of children and adults who are in need. Since its inception nearly 4 years ago, the Jimmie Johnson Foundation has contributed more than \$2 million to various organizations.

Mr. Speaker, for his racing accomplishments and his charitable efforts, let us, as a body, take this opportunity to congratulate Jimmie Johnson, the Associated Press Male Athlete of 2009, and of course the Lowe's Chevrolet team, for winning the NASCAR Sprint Cup Championship in 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 957. And I say to the gentleman from North Carolina, this is a great thing. And, of course, sometimes we do not pay tribute to people that need to have tribute paid to them, but this is a person that has accomplished great things, and I am happy my colleague (Mr. MCHENRY) has recommended that we recognize this effort.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank the chairman for his kind words.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution honoring the accomplishments of Jimmie Johnson, the 2009 NASCAR Sprint Cup champion. Now, this is a politically charged issue for my district because I represent a number of drivers and a number of NASCAR teams; and to honor any one of them, well, it's tough. It's like baseball in certain areas of the country or football or college football or college basketball in North Carolina. But NASCAR teams are real and potent in my district.

But this is a special resolution because Jimmie Johnson has achieved something no one else in NASCAR history has achieved, and that is four straight championships. He is with a great team, with a great crew chief, Chad Knaus. Powered by Hendrick Motor Sports and Chevrolet, the No. 48 Lowe's Chevy has done something unique in NASCAR history.

Jimmie Johnson started out in very humble roots in El Cajon, California; and now he resides in my home State

of North Carolina. He grew up in a working-class suburb, the son of a bulldozer operator and school bus driver who raised Jimmie Johnson and his two younger brothers in a modest home and made financial sacrifices to give their sons the best opportunity to pursue their passions; and for Jimmie, that was racing.

His love of speed was evident even from the time he was just a young child. He began his racing career on 50cc motorcycles when he was just 5 years old. From there, he moved up to four-wheelers where he found his true calling with four wheels—not two—and moved into his 2002 rookie season in NASCAR at the top level of the series. And he became the first rookie to sweep both races at one track, and that was done at Dover International Speedway in 2002. He also became the first rookie ever to lead in the point standings; and to date, that remains the case. He is still the only one in their rookie season to lead the point standing.

And he is named the Male Athlete of 2009 by the Associated Press, the 2009 Sprint Cup Series Driver of the Year, and was contender for Driver of the Decade for the 2000s.

In 2006, together with his wife, Chandra, he founded the Jimmie Johnson Foundation to assist children, families, and communities in need throughout the United States.

Jimmie rose from humble roots and achieved the pinnacle of success. Now he is on for the Drive for Five. He wants five in a row. His story is truly an embodiment of the American Dream. Jimmie Johnson and the No. 48 Lowe's Chevy have made history by being a part of the Nation's number one spectator sport.

NASCAR represents the best of American professional sports, especially in my region. They're unmatched by the loyalty of their fans and participation by Fortune 500 companies more so than any other sport. And with the iconic Daytona 500 quickly approaching in just over a week's time, please join me in honoring Jimmie Johnson for his seven wins, 16 top fives, 24 top tens, an unmatched Race for the Chase. In the final 10 races of 2009, he had an average Chase finish of 6.8, which is absolutely amazing considering the competition they currently have in NASCAR.

And we pay honor to Jimmie Johnson, Chad Knaus, and the whole crew of the No. 48 Chevrolet sponsored by Lowe's.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, again, I encourage my friends on both sides of the aisle to join me in congratulating Jimmie Johnson and the Lowe's Chevrolet team on the impressive accomplishment through the passage of House Resolution 957, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 957.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### NORTH AMERICAN INCLUSION MONTH

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1014) recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of North American Inclusion Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 1014

Whereas one in every five Americans struggles with some sort of disability, be it intellectual, physical or otherwise, and the need for inclusion of individuals with disabilities is a family, community, and national priority;

Whereas a similar ratio exists in the Jewish community, with over one million Jewish individuals living with a form of disability;

Whereas individuals with disabilities face significant disadvantages in educational and employment opportunities;

Whereas 70 percent of individuals with disabilities are unemployed or significantly underemployed;

Whereas special education and related programming do not address underlying needs for appropriate training to lead to greater independence and employment;

Whereas Yachad, the National Jewish Council for Disabilities, and its parent organization, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, is dedicated to addressing the needs of all individuals with disabilities and including them in the Jewish community;

Whereas Yachad provides programming for individuals with disabilities and their families to foster inclusion in communal happenings and assists in placing individuals with disabilities in employment; and

Whereas Yachad and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America are co-sponsoring North American Inclusion Month in February to increase public awareness of the life circumstances of individuals with disabilities, and the need for increased employment opportunities, better special education and increased inclusion of these individuals on the family, communal, and national levels: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives recognizes and supports the goals and ideals of North American Inclusion Month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1430

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to present H. Res. 1014 for consideration. This resolution draws public attention to the need for inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the greater community.

I introduced H. Res. 1014 on January 13, 2010, and the measure was favorably reported out of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform by unanimous consent on January 27, 2010. I am proud to say that the measure has bipartisan support from 59 Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, one in every five Americans has some form of disability. They face great difficulty in everyday life and significant disadvantages in education and employment. Men and women around the country work hard in areas like special education, job training, rehabilitation, and other efforts to address the needs of individuals with disabilities, and we can all be very proud of their work. But we should be sure to remember that individuals with disabilities still face a great deal of hardship.

These are our friends, our neighbors, and our family members and, of course, many, many, many times people that we see on a daily basis. They are our veterans. We must be sure to do our part to include these individuals in all facets of life.

North American Inclusion Month, recognized during the month of February, was first created in 2005, by Yachad, the Hebrew word for "together," the National Jewish Council for Disabilities, and its parent organization, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America. I would like to thank these groups for all the hard work they have done to educate people on this important issue, particularly in my district in Brooklyn.

In closing, I would also like to thank the gentleman from California, Congressman ISSA, who has worked very closely with me on this issue. And, of course, I really appreciate his involvement and his support to get us where we are today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1014, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's very kind and appropriate words. And I, too, rise in support of House Resolution 1014, recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of North American Inclusion Month, being the month of February.

Approximately 41.2 million Americans have a disability of some kind, and many of them are unemployed or underemployed and struggling to live on what they make or even to survive. Mildly disabled individuals make less each month than those who are not disabled, and the severely disabled individuals take home almost \$1,000 less than they otherwise would.

And while there are programs in place that provide job training for those with special needs, they often do not focus enough on helping those individuals become independent or find permanent employment. Many do, and there are many programs in our communities across the country, but both the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America and Yachad, the National Jewish Council for Disabilities, have partnered together for 2010 to promote North American Inclusion Month, observed each February to bring public attention to the needs of those with disabilities.

These organizations have taken it upon themselves to become leaders in promoting the message of Inclusion Month: The need for increased employment opportunities, better special education, and greater inclusion of disabled individuals at the family, community, and national levels.

It's something we all should support. And I certainly believe that this is a bipartisan resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, Martin Luther King said that I cannot be what I ought to be until the world is what it should be. And I think that this legislation really addresses that issue to say that we have to be concerned about others, those who are disabled. And let me again urge my colleagues to join me in calling for the great inclusion of individuals with disabilities by supporting H. Res. 1014.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1014.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

Brescia University for 60 years of leadership in higher education, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 1043

Whereas Brescia University was founded in 1950;

Whereas Brescia University is a Catholic University located in Owensboro, Kentucky; Whereas Brescia offers 6 different degrees in over 60 different programs;

Whereas students at Brescia University receive a personalized education with a 12 to 1 student to teacher ratio;

Whereas the Brescia Bearcats have 15 athletic teams that participate in National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics in the Kentucky Intercollegiate Athletic Conference;

Whereas Brescia University emphasizes "Making a difference", encouraging students to serve others in the community, and has established a history of serving Owensboro, Kentucky, and the surrounding region; and

Whereas for 60 years, Brescia University has provided a quality liberal arts education and worked to prepare its students for successful careers and service to others: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes Brescia University for 60 years of service as an institution of higher education; and

(2) commends Brescia University for leadership and service to students and the community of Owensboro, Kentucky, and the surrounding region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 1043 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today and support H. Res. 1043, which recognizes Brescia University for its 60 years of commitment and leadership in higher education.

Brescia University was founded in 1950 in Owensboro, Kentucky. It was created by the Ursuline Sisters of Mount St. Joseph as a Catholic institution, emphasizing the liberal arts and preparing its traditional and nontraditional students for successful careers and service to others. With a school motto of "Make a difference," the university instills the values of community, leadership, justice, and service in its students through the classes and activities they offer, as well as the staff and faculty that teach them. The university provides its students with a sense of faith in community on campus with courses in theology, philosophy,

ministry and spirituality, as well as opportunities for religious expression and faith enhancement. Throughout its existence, Brescia University has established a history of serving Owensboro and the surrounding region.

Brescia University also provides each of their students with a quality liberal arts education, helping to shape them into rounded citizens. Brescia offers six different degrees in over 60 different programs and offers small classes with frequent one-on-one time between teachers and students. Continuing the emphasis on the sense of community, the university takes pride in knowing all of their students individually. Each are provided all the resources and opportunities they need to find success in their lives so that they may fully participate in the life of the campus.

Brescia University also excels athletically. The university is home to 15 intercollegiate athletic teams. The Brescia Bearcats, as they are called, are members of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics in the Kentucky Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, and recently added competitive men's and women's track teams this year.

The mission of Brescia University to form well-educated, well-rounded young adults with a sense of community and service to others is one that should be encouraged in all educational institutions in our country. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and thank Mr. GUTHRIE for bringing this resolution forward.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the resolution before us, House Resolution 1043, recognizing Brescia University for 60 years of leadership in higher education.

Brescia University, located in Owensboro, Kentucky, was founded by the Ursuline Sisters of Mount St. Joseph in 1950. Brescia began as Brescia Hall, was founded as Brescia College in 1950, and became Brescia University in 1998. The university now offers undergraduate and graduate course work for career preparation firmly rooted in the liberal arts.

Brescia University offers various degrees, including associate degrees, bachelor degrees, and master degrees. The institution offers degrees in various programs, including education, medical technology, and computer and mathematical science. Brescia also aims to meet the needs of the adult learners by providing tailored programs in their STARS program for adults returning to school.

Brescia University Bearcats have 15 intercollegiate athletic teams. The Bearcats participate in baseball, basketball, cross-country, golf, soccer, softball, tennis, volleyball, and outdoor track as of this spring. Brescia competes in the Kentucky Intercollegiate Athletic Conference in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics and has excelled in such.

#### RECOGNIZING BRESCIA UNIVERSITY

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1043) recognizing



Brescia provides invaluable services to its students, as well as to the community. Since the founding of the university, Brescia has emphasized service to others. In keeping with the tradition of the founders, Brescia students are encouraged to assist and serve the Owensboro community and the surrounding region.

It is a privilege to stand before the House today to congratulate Brescia University on the occasion of their 60th anniversary and to recognize the university for 60 years of leadership in higher education. I extend my congratulations to Brescia University, the faculty and staff, the students and the alumni. I also want to thank my colleague from Kentucky, BRETT GUTHRIE, for introducing this resolution.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution, and I yield such time as he might consume to my colleague, BRETT GUTHRIE.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentlelady from Ohio for her kind words about Brescia University. I rise today in support of House Resolution 1043 recognizing Brescia University for 60 years of leadership in higher education.

Brescia University, located in Owensboro, Kentucky, has provided quality liberal arts education and worked to prepare its students for successful careers since 1950. The only Catholic university in western Kentucky, Brescia's mission and spirit emphasizes "Making a difference," encouraging students to serve others in the community.

For over 60 years, the faculty, staff, and students have carried out the vision of their founder, Sister Angela Merici, who believed that education creates a stronger and more just society. These individuals have given so much to the Owensboro community and the entire region.

Students at Brescia enjoy a more personalized education with a 12:1 student-to-teacher ratio. Brescia takes pride in creating an atmosphere of community, while paying close attention to the individuality of their students. The university offers six different degrees in over 60 different programs, as well as 15 athletic teams that participate in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics.

I'm proud to represent Brescia University in Washington, and I'm proud to represent the Owensboro-Daviess County community in which it is located. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution and join me in commending Brescia for its commitment to service, faith, and education.

Mr. PETRI. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Mr. GUTHRIE and urge all of my colleagues to support House Resolution 1043.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1043, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### RECOGNIZING 49TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTEGRATION OF NEW ORLEANS SCHOOLS

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 901) recognizing November 14, 2009, as the 49th anniversary of the first day of integrated schools in New Orleans, Louisiana, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

##### H. RES. 901

Whereas, in 1954, the Supreme Court ruled that segregated schools violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution;

Whereas Judge J. Skelly Wright, of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, ordered the Orleans Parish School Board to develop a school desegregation plan in 1956 and, after years of delay, in 1960, ordered the Orleans Parish School Board to carry out a plan designed by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana;

Whereas 6 years after the Brown v. Board of Education (347 U.S. 483) decision, on November 14, 1960, Ruby Bridges, at the age of 6, became the first African-American student to attend the all-white William Frantz Elementary School in New Orleans, Louisiana;

Whereas Ruby Bridges had the courage to attend the William Frantz Elementary School every day during the 1960-61 school year despite ongoing riots and protests in New Orleans, having to be escorted to school by Federal marshals, and having no other students in her classroom;

Whereas Ruby Bridges was also supported by her white first-grade school teacher, Ms. Barbara Henry, whose lessons remain with Ruby Bridges to this day;

Whereas Ms. Henry faced retaliation for teaching Ruby Bridges by not being invited to come back and teach at William Frantz School following the 1960-61 school year;

Whereas, in 1995, Ruby Bridges contributed to "The Story of Ruby Bridges", a book for children, and, in 1999, wrote "Through My Eyes" to help educate children and people of all ages about her experiences and the importance of tolerance;

Whereas Ruby Bridges established the Ruby Bridges Foundation in 1999 to help eliminate racism and improve society by educating students about the experiences of Ruby Bridges, discuss ongoing efforts to promote diversity, and provide lessons students can take back to their own communities; and

Whereas, in 2002, the Ruby Bridges Foundation, along with the Simon Wiesenthal Center's Museum for Tolerance in Los Angeles,

launched The Ruby's Bridges Project, a program that brought together students from diverse backgrounds to develop relationship-building skills and promote an appreciation of one another: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 49th anniversary of the first day of integrated schools in New Orleans, Louisiana;

(2) remembers Judge J. Skelly Wright for his advocacy, support, and lifelong commitment to promoting civil rights, fairness, and equality;

(3) commends Ruby Bridges for her bravery and courage 49 years ago, and for her lifetime commitment to raising awareness of diversity through improved educational opportunities for all children; and

(4) supports policies and efforts to promote equal opportunities for all students regardless of their backgrounds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on H. Res. 901 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 901, which recognizes the 49th anniversary of integrated schools in New Orleans, Louisiana.

Forty-nine years ago, Ruby Bridges became the first African American student to attend the all-white William Frantz Elementary School in New Orleans. Amidst deadly threats, violence, and abuse, Ruby attended her first grade class every day over the course of the year. She was escorted to school by Federal marshals just so she could receive the same education as her white peers. When Ruby entered her new classroom, the white students refused to sit and learn next to her.

Ruby was fortunate to have Ms. Barbara Henry as her teacher during this tumultuous year. Ms. Henry instructed Ruby in an empty classroom over the course of the school year. The two played games, talked, and learned from each other amongst the racially tense times. It is not surprising that Ms. Bridges still considers her year with Ms. Henry as one of the most pleasant times in her life.

Outside the classroom, Ruby came face to face with the ugliness that erupted during this time. Militant segregationists took to the streets in protest, and riots erupted all over the city. Her family also felt the impact of her bravery. Her father, Abon Bridges, and her grandparents were all fired from their jobs. However, many folks, both black and white, supported the Bridges family during their trying

time. People sent letters of support, neighbors watched after their house, and helpful friends and community members made financial contributions.

□ 1445

In 1954, the Supreme Court ruled in *Brown v. Board of Education* that segregated schools violated the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. Prominent figures like the Reverend Martin Luther King, Justice Thurgood Marshall, and the Little Rock Nine are civil rights activists who are typically credited with moving the civil rights movement forward. While the story of Ruby Bridges is not widely known, her contributions to the movement are equally deserving of great recognition.

Today, Ruby stands as a hero to all of us. She has taken the lessons she has learned from her youth and dedicated her life to helping students. Her foundation helps students deal with racism and diversity at school and within their own community. She also wrote "Through My Eyes," explaining her first-grade experience, and now partners with organizations that promote nonviolence in schools. Her monumental contributions to the American civil rights movement deserve to be recognized.

I want to thank Representative GWEN MOORE for bringing this resolution forward, and urge my colleagues to support this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am delighted today to rise in support of the resolution before us, House Resolution 901, introduced by my colleague from the State of Wisconsin, GWEN MOORE, recognizing November 14, 2009, as the 49th anniversary of the first day of integrated schools in New Orleans, Louisiana.

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* that State laws establishing separate public schools for black and white students denied black children equal educational opportunities. Louisiana District Judge J. Skelly Wright ordered the Orleans Parish Board to carry out a plan to integrate the State's schools. After a 6-year delay, Ruby Bridges became the first African American to attend the all-white William Frantz Elementary School in New Orleans, Louisiana.

Ruby Bridges faced many challenges during her first day and ongoing years at William Frantz. Only Barbara Henry was willing to teach Ruby, and for over a year Mrs. Henry taught her alone. Mrs. Henry's lessons left an indelible mark on Ruby and remain with her to this day.

Ruby and her family suffered many hardships as a result of Ruby's attendance at William Frantz. However, many of the community showed support in a variety of ways. Some white families continued to send their children to Frantz, despite the protests, and local members of the community

walked behind the Federal marshals' car on the trips to school.

Today, Ruby Bridges is the chair of the Ruby Bridges Foundation, which she formed in 1999 to promote the values of tolerance, respect, and appreciation of all differences.

In 2002, the Ruby Bridges Foundation, along with the Simon Wiesenthal Center Museum for Tolerance in Los Angeles, launched the Ruby's Bridges Project. The project brought together students from diverse backgrounds to develop relationship-building skills and promote an appreciation of one another.

So I stand before you today to recognize the 49th anniversary of the first integrated schools in New Orleans, Louisiana. I also want to acknowledge Judge J. Skelly Wright and Mrs. Barbara Henry for their support and lifelong commitment to civil rights and equal opportunity. In addition, I want to commend Ruby Bridges for her bravery and courage 49 years ago and for her commitment to raising awareness of diversity through educational opportunities for all children.

I thank my colleague, GWEN MOORE of the State of Wisconsin, for giving us an opportunity to recognize her contribution. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. I am pleased to recognize the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for such time as she may consume.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Wisconsin for supporting House Resolution 901.

I can tell you that you have heard the history of Ruby Bridges, but in my own Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, last spring another teacher, a first-grade teacher, started a class project to teach her 6-year-old students the historic impact of Ruby Bridges during last February's Black History Month.

The students, recognizing the bravery of another child their age, thought Ruby Bridges should have her own special day of recognition. So what started as a very modest class project sort of built this groundswell where 2,200 signatures were collected throughout the Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin, and indeed throughout the State. The project gained letters of commendation from Milwaukee Mayor Tom Barrett and from then-State Superintendent of Education Elizabeth Burmaster. They sent the full list to President Barack Obama and other elected officials in support of a Ruby Bridges Day.

It is so truly remarkable that a first-grade class in my district not only learned the historic lessons of 6-year-old Ruby Bridges, but also learned how extraordinary it is to have a voice in this great country of ours through the power of the pen. In fact, the initiative of these small children brings me to the floor of the House of Representa-

tives today seeking support for H. Res. 901.

Ruby Bridges is the young black girl in the classic Norman Rockwell painting wearing a white dress, escorted, for her safety, by Federal marshals to school. And years after the Supreme Court had ruled the segregated schools were unconstitutional, Louisiana was finally forced, under a Federal court order, to implement a desegregation plan for the New Orleans public schools.

How frightened but how brave was a 6-year-old girl who took that test and qualified to become one of the first official African American students to attend this all-white school. And although she was only 6 years old, Mr. Speaker, and the lone black student at the school, she never missed a day, attended each and every day. Ruby, a jewel, Bridges, bridging a cultural gap.

I am so proud to support this resolution honoring Ruby Bridges.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the Representative from New Orleans, Louisiana, JOSEPH CAO.

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to request my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 901.

In 1956, the Orleans Parish School Board was ordered to develop a school desegregation plan. After years of delay, a young girl by the name of Ruby Bridges became one of the first black children to attend an integrated school. Upon her arrival, every white parent came to remove their child. All but one white teacher refused to teach. That one teacher instructed Ruby in a room by herself for a full year.

This experience did not deter Ruby, who not only completed her education but went on to found the Ruby Bridges Foundation. The foundation's mission: To promote the values of tolerance, respect, and appreciation of all differences.

I was honored to have met Mrs. Bridges in New Orleans on a number of occasions, and she still expresses the same radiant smile now as she did in 1956. She is truly an extraordinary woman.

At a time when my city is fighting to rebuild its schools and build up young people, I am thankful to have her as an ally and an inspiration for future generations. And, having lived in New Orleans all of her life, I am sure she would like to join me in proclaiming "Who Dat."

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting House Resolution 901, recognizing the 49th anniversary of the first day of integrated schools in New Orleans, Louisiana.

Mr. PETRI. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to close by of course recognizing the fact that, as we begin Black History Month, there is no better person for us to recognize today than Ruby Bridges. I want to thank her for her courage,



her determination, and the work she is doing today to help students across our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution, H. Res. 901.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H. Res. 901, a resolution to recognize November 14, 2009 as the 49th anniversary of the first day of integrated schools in New Orleans, Louisiana. I urge my colleagues to support this meaningful and important resolution.

In 1954, the Supreme Court ruled that segregated schools violated the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. On November 14, 1960, Ruby Bridges, at the age of six, became the first African American student to attend an all-white school in New Orleans, Louisiana. Ruby Bridges attended William Frantz Elementary School every day, despite riots and protests. Ruby was taught by Barbara Henry in a classroom with no other students. Sadly, due to her efforts to educate young Ruby, Ms. Henry was not invited back to teach at William Frantz Elementary school after that year. In 1999, Ruby Bridges established the Ruby Bridges Foundation that fights racism and works to improve society by sharing the experiences of Ruby Bridges.

Of course the need to integrate schools was not unique to New Orleans. The University of Georgia, UGA, was a segregated school until 1961. UGA had strict admissions requirements—such as requiring personal recommendations from alumni, all of whom were white—in order to block African Americans from being admitted. In 1960, Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes applied to UGA. They were more than qualified for admission. Holmes was valedictorian of his high school and senior class president. Hunter finished third in her graduating class and edited the school paper. The University rejected their applications, providing a number of different—and ultimately false—reasons for denying their admission. On January 6, 1961, federal judge William A. Bootle found that “the two plaintiffs are fully qualified for immediate admission, and would already have been admitted if not for their race and color.” This ruling became national news and the students were admitted and met on registration day by protests. On the third evening after their registration, a large group of students showed up outside of their residence and began hurling bricks and bottles before being dispersed by police. After this incident, the Dean of Students then told them that he was withdrawing them from admission for “their own safety.” This decision was quickly overruled by a court order after over 400 faculty members signed a resolution to bring them back. Holmes graduated from UGA and earned a medical degree from Emory University in Georgia. Hunter graduated with a degree in journalism and worked for the New York Times, PBS, and CNN.

Thanks to the courage of these individuals and many others like them, we are now as close to full integration as we have ever been, and continue to gain ground on that ultimate goal.

As President Obama recently stated during his unveiling of his new budget proposal, “the most important tool to combat poverty is a world class education.” Prior to November 14, 1960, African Americans were a long way from having the opportunity to receive a world

class education. Although the desegregation of schools did not instantly give African Americans a high quality education, it was the first step in a long battle for equality in educational opportunities. Without the events that took place on November 14, 1960, and the bravery of Ruby Bridges, Barbara Henry, Hamilton Holmes, and Charlayne Hunter, we would not be where we are today in relation to educational equality for African Americans. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. FUDGE. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 901, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### HONORING MEDGAR EVERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1022) honoring the life and sacrifice of Medgar Evers and congratulating the United States Navy for naming a supply ship after Medgar Evers.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

##### H. RES. 1022

Whereas Medgar Evers was born on July 2, 1925, in Decatur, Mississippi;

Whereas Mr. Evers was hired by Dr. Theodore Roosevelt Mason Howard to sell insurance for the Magnolia Mutual Life Insurance Company;

Whereas Mr. Evers was inducted into United States Army in 1943 and fought in the Battle of Normandy;

Whereas Dr. Howard, as President of the Regional Council of Negro Leadership, helped to introduce Mr. Evers to civil rights activism;

Whereas Mr. Evers applied to the then-segregated University of Mississippi School of Law in February 1954;

Whereas Mr. Evers' application was rejected resulting in a National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) campaign to desegregate the school;

Whereas Mr. Evers was hired as a field secretary for the NAACP;

Whereas Mr. Evers was the target of a number of death threats as a result of his activism;

Whereas, on May 28, 1963, a Molotov cocktail was thrown into the carport of Mr. Evers's home and five days before his death Mr. Evers was assaulted by a car outside of an NAACP office;

Whereas Mr. Evers was assassinated in the driveway of his home in Jackson after returning from a meeting with NAACP lawyers on June 12, 1963;

Whereas this assassination occurred just hours after President John F. Kennedy's speech on national television in support of civil rights;

Whereas the death of Mr. Evers helped to prompt President John F. Kennedy to ask Congress for a comprehensive civil rights bill;

Whereas that bill, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, was signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson;

Whereas Mr. Evers' assassination has been memorialized in numerous popular songs, movies, and written pieces;

Whereas in 1969, Medgar Evers College was established in Brooklyn, New York, as part of the City University of New York;

Whereas, on June 28, 1992, the city of Jackson, Mississippi erected a statue in honor of Mr. Evers;

Whereas in December 2004, the Jackson City Council changed the name of the city's airport to Jackson-Evers International Airport; and

Whereas, on October 9, 2009, Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus announced that the United States Naval Ship (USNS) Medgar Evers (T-AKE-13), a Lewis and Clark-class dry cargo ship, will be named after Mr. Evers: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the life and sacrifice of Medgar Evers;

(2) recognizes the important role Mr. Evers played in securing civil rights for all people in the United States; and

(3) congratulates the United States Navy for honoring Medgar Evers by naming the United States Naval Ship Medgar Evers after him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as we begin Black History Month, I rise in support of H. Res. 1022, to honor the life of Medgar Evers and congratulate the United States Navy for naming a ship in his honor.

Medgar Evers was born in Decatur, Mississippi, on July 2, 1925, and he was murdered on June 12, 1963, in the driveway of his Jackson, Mississippi, home. His upbringing was marked by the racism and violence of that time. Before Evers even reached high school, he had endured the lynching of a close family friend.

As a young man, Mr. Evers was determined to get his education. He earned his high school diploma, enduring taunts and abuse from white schoolchildren.

In 1943, he was drafted into the Army, and he bravely fought for his country

at the Battle of Normandy and was honorably discharged in 1946.

Upon his return home, Mr. Evers completed a degree in business administration at Alcorn State University. He played football, ran track, joined the debate team, and sang in the university choir. He married his classmate, Myrlie Beasley, in 1951.

□ 1500

Beside me is a photograph of Medgar Evers. He looks to be very fit and focused, and I daresay Herschel Walker has a slight resemblance to Mr. Evers. And that is a compliment, by the way.

After completing that degree and getting married, Mr. Evers then moved to Mound Bayou, Mississippi, and joined the Regional Council of Negro Leadership. He helped organize a boycott of service stations that denied African Americans use of their restrooms. In 1954, the year I was born, Mr. Evers applied to the segregated University of Mississippi School of Law. When his application was rejected, he became the focus of an NAACP campaign to desegregate the school.

He was hired as the NAACP's first field secretary in Mississippi. Mr. Evers was instrumental in desegregating the University of Mississippi, and gained prominence through his work with the NAACP. As his fame and success grew, so did the danger that he faced. Death threats became commonplace. But he persisted, a true American pioneer. In May of 1963, a Molotov cocktail was thrown into the carport of his home. And then 5 days before his death, he was nearly run over by a car outside of a NAACP office.

On June 12, 1963, while carrying T-shirts that read, quote, "Jim Crow Must Go," Medgar Evers was assassinated in the driveway of his home in Jackson, Mississippi. Just hours earlier, President John F. Kennedy had delivered his speech in support of civil rights legislation on national television. Evers' assassination is said to have helped prompt President Kennedy to ask for a comprehensive civil rights bill, which became the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and which was an historic and mighty blow to the institutionalized racism in America. Mr. Evers was buried in Arlington National Cemetery, and received full military honors in front of a crowd of about 3,000 people.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, not only honors the life and sacrifice of Mr. Evers, but it also commends the Navy for its recent decision to name a ship in his honor. On October 9, 2009, Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus announced the United States Naval Ship MEDGAR EVERS, a Lewis and Clark-class dry cargo ship.

For decades, Medgar Evers' legacy has inspired Americans. He fought diligently for what was right, and gave his life to the cause of civil rights. His life has been memorialized in song, in film, in sculpture, and now by the United States Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD an exchange

of letters between House Judiciary Committee Chairman JOHN CONYERS and House Armed Services Committee Chairman IKE SKELTON. I am privileged to serve on both of these very important committees.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, January 28, 2010.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 20, 2010, the House Resolution 1022, "Honoring the life and sacrifice of Medgar Evers and congratulating the United States Navy for naming a supply ship after Medgar Evers," was introduced in the House. As you know, this measure was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H. Res. 1022 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over this legislation, the Committee on Armed Services will waive further consideration of H. Res. 1022. I do so with the understanding that by waiving further consideration of the resolution, the Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claims over similar measures.

I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter and a copy of your response in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, February 2, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,  
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding your Committee's jurisdictional interest in H. Res 1022, Honoring the life and sacrifice of Medgar Evers and congratulating the United States Navy for naming a supply ship after Medgar Evers.

I appreciate your willingness to support expediting floor consideration of this important resolution today. I understand and agree that this is without prejudice to your Committee's jurisdictional interests in this or similar legislation in the future.

Per your request, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record in the debate on the resolution. Thank you for your cooperation as we work towards passing this resolution.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,  
Chairman.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I support House Resolution 1022. This resolution honors the life and sacrifice of Medgar Evers, and also it congratulates the United States Navy for naming a supply ship after Mr. Evers in 2009. Known today for his struggles in the civil rights movement in Mississippi and his untimely death at the hands of an assassin, Medgar Evers left

behind an impressive record of achievement.

He was born in 1925 near Decatur, Mississippi, and he entered the United States Army in 1943 and served in Normandy in World War II. He received a B.A. degree in 1952, and began to establish local chapters of the NAACP. He organized boycotts of gasoline stations that refused to allow blacks to use the restrooms there. In 1954, he applied to the then-segregated University of Mississippi School of Law. And when his application was rejected, he filed a lawsuit against the university. He became the focus of the NAACP effort to desegregate the school, a case aided by the United States Supreme Court in a ruling of *Brown v. Board of Education* that segregation was unconstitutional.

Evers and his wife eventually moved to Jackson, Mississippi, where they worked together to set up an NAACP office. Evers began investigating violent crimes committed against African Americans, and sought ways to prevent them in the future. His boycott of Jackson, Mississippi merchants in the early 1960s attracted national media attention. And his efforts to have James Meredith admitted to the University of Mississippi in 1962 led to much needed Federal help. Due in part to Mr. Evers' work, Meredith was admitted to the University of Mississippi.

On June 12, 1963, Evers returned home just after midnight from a series of NAACP functions, and he was leaving his car with a handful of T-shirts that read, "Jim Crow Must Go." When he was leaving his vehicle, he was shot in the back by an assassin. His wife and children, who had been waiting for him, found him bleeding to death on the doorstep some 30 feet from where he was gunned down. Shortly thereafter, he died.

The death of Mr. Evers helped prompt President John F. Kennedy and others to ask Congress to pass a comprehensive civil rights bill. And in 1964, the Civil Rights Act was signed into law. In the years following his death, a number of songs, books, and movies paid tribute to Mr. Evers' sacrifice and his peaceful pursuit of justice and equality for all Americans. Mr. Evers is quoted as saying, "When you hate, the only one that suffers is you, because most of the people you hate don't know it, and the rest don't care." He also continually advised that violence is not the way.

His life serves as an inspiration to all Americans on how citizens can use peaceful and democratic means to effect a positive change within our democracy. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great city of Washington, D.C. I would point out that she is a civil rights legend of her own accord.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the generous gentleman from Georgia and our colleague on the other side as well for

their words and for bringing forward this resolution honoring the United States Navy, and especially honoring Medgar Evers.

There is some context that is necessary here. Mississippi was not only late to the civil rights movement, Mississippi was last to the civil rights movement. And there was a reason for that. Because it was delayed. Remember the sit-ins began February 1960, just 50 years ago. That was celebrated just yesterday with the opening of a civil rights museum in Greensboro. Years passed. And you did not see young people coming forward in Mississippi, young and foolish, and a young law student, because Mississippi was so heralded for its reputation for violently opposing civil rights. That is where I wanted to be.

From my first day in Mississippi in June of 1963, I was baptized by crisis. I spent the day with Medgar Evers. I was only a second-year law student, but there were so few people with the skills associated with lawyers who had been in the movement, that he tried to get me to stay in Jackson. But I had committed to Bob Moses, the legendary head of a tiny movement in the delta area of Mississippi, to go to the Mississippi delta.

I spent the day with Medgar Evers taking me around to meet members of the movement, to try to get me to remain, and finally depositing me at—was it a Greyhound or a Trailways bus station? I do not recall. But he put me on that bus, he went home, and he was assassinated in his own driveway. I had learned about it the next morning when a tiny little girl came to wake me up in a sharecropper's house who had accommodated me as a member of the movement to say that Mr. Evers has been shot. The moment exists in my brain and in my heart to this very moment, that unspeakable moment.

Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. John Lewis was the chair of SNCC at that time. Young people had come forward to risk arrest and beatings literally in every State of the union except Mississippi. But there was nobody like the four young students in Greensboro who stepped forward in 1960. And yet I come to Mississippi in 1963, and I assure you not to sit in. But there hadn't been a single sit-in in Mississippi. So here came a middle-aged father and husband and said, "Okay, I will lead the sit-ins in the biggest city in Mississippi."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. NORTON. Medgar Evers was not a student. He was not young and foolish the way the students were. He had a lot to risk, and he risked it all. He and a very few others stepped forward to do that first sit-in at a Woolworth's. He paid a price that day. They were beat horribly. And he paid the ultimate price when they took his life in that driveway.

It is time for the United States of America now to step forward, as Medgar Evers did, and recognize this one of a kind American hero. I applaud our country and our Navy for naming a United States Naval ship the MEDGAR EVERS.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res 1022, to honor the life and sacrifices of Medgar Evers as well as his contributions to the African American Civil Rights Movement.

Evers was born in segregated Decatur, Mississippi, on July 2, 1925, and had to deal with daily threats, insults and institutionalized discrimination and racism. Like many of his fellow African Americans, Evers returned to the United States after serving in France during World War II only to learn that nothing had changed for African Americans.

Despite this, Evers went to Acorn College in Lorman, Mississippi, and received his BA in Business Administration, an amazing accomplishment for any African American at the time. He went on to marry his classmate and sweetheart, Myrlie Beasley.

The young couple moved to Mound Bayou, Mississippi, where Evers worked at the Magnolia Mutual Life Insurance Company. The president of the company, Dr. T.R.M. Howard, also served as president of the Regional Council of Negro Leadership, and helped to introduce Mr. Evers to civil rights activism. Evers became heavily involved in successful boycotts of service stations that denied Blacks to use their restrooms throughout the state.

Evers went on to work as a member of the Mississippi NAACP as its field secretary and had an instrumental role in the desegregation of the University of Mississippi, which led to constant threats against his life and his family. On June 12, 1963, at the age of 37, Medgar Evers was shot outside his home. He died 50 minutes later in the hospital. His murderer, Bryan De La Beckwith, went to trial twice before finally being found guilty of murder and being sent to prison on February 5, 1994, three decades after Evers' death.

Medgar Evers, in life and in death, left an impact on America. His death helped prompt President John F. Kennedy to ask Congress for a comprehensive civil rights bill, one that would be passed during the Johnson administration and finally ended legal segregation in the United States.

I commend Representative HENRY JOHNSON of Georgia's Fourth Congressional District for introducing this important piece of legislation to the House and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this measure.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today, we recognize a brave martyr of the civil rights movement, Medgar Evers, who also is being honored by the U.S. Navy with the naming of a dry cargo ship after him.

Medgar Evers served his country in the U.S. Army during World War II and fought to liberate Europe at the Battle of Normandy. After he was honorably discharged in 1946, he returned home to Mississippi to find racial discrimination and rampant prejudice. This injustice compelled him to fight another battle, this time for civil rights and racial equality at home. As NAACP's first field secretary in Mississippi, he played a leading role in desegregating the University of Mississippi in 1962, as well as led a public investigation into the murder of Emmett Till.

Medgar Evers received numerous death threats, yet he was never deterred. He once said, "You can kill a man, but you can't kill an idea." There is a bittersweet truth to his words as Evers was murdered in 1963 by one intent on maintaining segregation. Although Evers' dedication to ensuring equality cost him his life, his sacrifice was not in vain. Following Medgar Evers' death, there was a renewed impetus toward passing a civil rights bill, allowing Medgar Evers' ideas to live on.

Two months after Evers' murder, President John F. Kennedy, while addressing the U.S. Naval Academy, said, "any man who may be asked in this century what he did to make his life worthwhile, I think can respond with a good deal of pride and satisfaction: 'I served in the United States Navy.'"

With the christening of the USNS *Medgar Evers*, there is now a physical link between honorable naval service and the courageous life of Medgar Evers. I hope that as this ship sails from port-to-port, it will remind all nations, including our own, of the ultimate sacrifice Evers made in the pursuit of justice.

I want to commend my friend and colleague from Georgia, HANK JOHNSON, for introducing this resolution, and I urge its adoption by the full House.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today in support of H. Res. 1022 "Honoring the life and sacrifice of Medgar Evers and congratulating the United States Navy for naming a supply ship after Medgar Evers."

I would like to begin by thanking my colleague Representative HANK JOHNSON for introducing this resolution in the House, as it is important that we honor and remember Medgar Evers for his service to the United States both on the battlefield as an Army sergeant in World War II as well as his service to the United States through his leadership in the Civil Rights Movement of the 20th Century.

Evers was born in Decatur, Mississippi, to Jessie and James Evers in 1925 and grew up on his father's small farm. After reaching adolescence, Evers had a difficult time in obtaining the high school level education he so desperately wanted. Evers however was determined. Every day he would walk 12 miles, each way to school and frequently had objects thrown at him by White children passing by in school buses.

In addition to the heckling he frequently received on his way to school, Evers suffered several other seriously traumatic events as a child. In one such instance, a close family friend was kidnapped, beaten up and lynched by a group of White supremacists. Evers was shocked when there was no response to this horrible attack by any local law enforcement officers and no subsequent legal action was taken up in the judicial system.

Evers witnessed several other brutal actions taken against local blacks in Decatur, Mississippi, as a youth. He was once quoted as saying: "I used to watch the Saturday night sport of White men trying to run down a Negro with their car, or White gangs coming through town to beat up a Negro." Evers said that sometimes the attackers would even leave the dead bodies of Black men out in the streets and would hang the bloody clothes in public to leave a message of fear.

Fortunately, Evers was able to keep his head high and eventually earned his high

school diploma in Decatur, Mississippi, before joining the U.S. Army. Evers joined the Army during World War II, fought in France, the European Theatre of WWII and was honorably discharged in 1945 as a Sergeant after admirably serving his country.

After being discharged, Evers attended Alcorn College, (now known as Alcorn State University) in Lorman, Mississippi and participated in a wide variety of activities from debate team to the track and football teams. At Alcorn College, Evers met and began dating Myrlie Beasley. The two were eventually married on December 24, 1951.

Soon after marriage, the couple moved to Mound Bayou, Mississippi, where Evers began selling insurance for the Magnolia Mutual Life Insurance Company. It was there that Evers met Dr. Theodore Roosevelt Mason Howard, the president of the Regional Council of Negro Leadership, RCNL, a civil rights and pro self-help organization. Evers soon became a dynamic member of the RCNL and thus began his political activism career.

When his application to the then-segregated University of Mississippi Law School was rejected, Evers filed a lawsuit against the university, and became the focus of an NAACP campaign to desegregate the university. That same year, due to his involvement, the NAACP's National Office suggested he become Mississippi's first field secretary for the NAACP.

On November 24, 1954, Evers was appointed Mississippi's first field secretary for the NAACP. After becoming field secretary, Evers was involved in a boycott campaign against White merchants and was instrumental in eventually desegregating the University of Mississippi when that institution was finally forced to enroll James Meredith in 1962.

Sadly, Evers was assassinated outside his home on June 12, 1963, just after returning from a meeting with several NAACP lawyers. Though he was killed in this tragic attack, the legacy that Evers left behind helped to change the course of history and left a strong impact on the Civil Rights Movement.

Designated T-AKE 13, *Medgar Evers* will be the 13th ship of the class, and is being built by General Dynamics NASSCO in San Diego. As a combat logistics force ship, *Medgar Evers* will help the Navy maintain a worldwide forward presence by delivering ammunition, food, fuel, and other dry cargo to U.S. and allied ships at sea.

As part of Military Sealift Command's Naval Fleet Auxiliary Force, *Medgar Evers* will be designated as a United States Naval Ship, USNS, and will be crewed by 124 civil service mariners and 11 Navy sailors. The ship is designed to operate independently for extended periods at sea, can carry a helicopter, is 689 feet in length, has an overall beam of 106 feet, has a navigational draft 30 feet, displaces approximately 42,000 tons, and is capable of reaching a speed of 20 knots using a single-shaft, diesel-electric propulsion system.

Because of the extensive role Evers had in the Civil Rights Movement and because of his exemplary service in the Armed Forces during World War II, it is important that we recognize this hero for his service to our Nation. I ask my colleagues for their support of this resolution and ask for their continued support of similar national heroes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, before I yield back I will say that if Medgar Evers were alive today, he would be fighting alongside Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for freedom in Washington, D.C. What I am talking about is the ability of residents of Washington, D.C., to be able to vote, to have a Congressperson who has full voting rights in this body.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1022.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1515

#### NATIONAL STALKING AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 960) expressing support for designation of January 2010 as "National Stalking Awareness Month" to raise awareness and encourage prevention of stalking.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 960

Whereas in a 1-year period, an estimated 3,400,000 people in the United States reported being stalked, and 75 percent of victims are stalked by someone who is not a stranger;

Whereas 81 percent of women, who are stalked by an intimate partner, are also physically assaulted by that partner, and 76 percent of women, who are killed by an intimate partner, were also stalked by that intimate partner;

Whereas 11 percent reported having been stalked for more than 5 years and one-fourth of victims reported having been stalked almost every day;

Whereas 1 in 4 victims reported that stalkers had used technology, such as e-mail or instant messaging, to follow and harass them, and 1 in 13 said stalkers had used electronic devices to intrude on their lives;

Whereas stalking victims are forced to take drastic measures to protect themselves, such as changing jobs, obtaining protection orders, relocating, and changing their identities;

Whereas 1 in 7 victims moved in an effort to escape their stalker;

Whereas approximately 130,000 victims reported having been fired or asked to leave their job because of the stalking, and about 1 in 8 lost time from work because they feared for their safety or were taking steps, such as seeking a restraining order, to protect themselves;

Whereas less than half of victims report stalking to police and only 7 percent con-

tacted a victim service provider, shelter, or hotline;

Whereas stalking is a crime that cuts across race, age, culture, gender, sexual orientation, physical and mental ability, and economic status;

Whereas stalking is a crime under Federal law and under the laws of all 50 States, the United States Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Uniform Code of Military Justice;

Whereas there are national organizations, local victim service organizations, prosecutors' offices, and law enforcement agencies that stand ready to assist stalking victims and who are working diligently to craft competent, thorough, and innovative responses to stalking;

Whereas there is a need to enhance the criminal justice system's response to stalking and stalking victims, including aggressive investigation and prosecution, and increase the availability of victim services across the country tailored to meet the needs of stalking victims;

Whereas, 2010 marks 10 years in which the Stalking Resource Center has increased national awareness of stalking and enhanced local responses to stalking victims through training over 35,000 law enforcement, prosecutors, victim service providers, and other community stakeholders, and provided assistance to jurisdictions working to enhance their stalking laws; and

Whereas January 2010 would be an appropriate month to designate as "National Stalking Awareness Month": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of "National Stalking Awareness Month" to educate the people of the United States about stalking;

(2) encourages the people of the United States to applaud the efforts of the many victim service providers, law enforcement, prosecutors, national and community organizations, and private sector supporters for their efforts in promoting awareness about stalking;

(3) encourages policymakers, criminal justice officials, victim service and social service agencies, colleges and universities, nonprofits, and others to recognize the need to increase awareness of stalking and the availability of services for stalking victims; and

(4) urges national and community organizations, businesses in the private sector, and the media to promote awareness of the crime of stalking through "National Stalking Awareness Month".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 960 expresses support for January 2010, being designated as "National Stalking Awareness Month." Every year, Mr. Speaker,

an estimated 3.4 million people are the victims of stalking. Stalking occurs through many different behaviors, such as unwanted phone calls, letters or emails, the victim being followed, or a stalker showing up at places without a legitimate reason. While these individual acts may not be criminal in and of themselves, collectively and repetitively these behaviors can cause a victim to fear for his or her safety.

This crime of stalking can be extremely dangerous. The fear and mental anguish that stalking causes can leave a victim's life in shambles. Anxiety, insomnia, or severe depression is much more prevalent among stalking victims than within the general population. This is especially the case if the stalking involves being followed or having one's property destroyed.

Over 12 percent of employed stalking victims report losing time from work as a result of their victimization, and more than half lose 5 days of work or more. In fact, many stalking victims have been forced to relocate their residences, and they often need psychological counseling. Stalking is often a precursor to physical attacks on a victim. This is why stalking is a crime in all 50 States and in the District of Columbia and is a crime under Federal law as well. Over 75 percent of women murdered by an intimate partner had been stalked by that partner before being killed. Victims are increasingly vulnerable to the crime of stalking, with advances in technology giving stalkers more access to the victims' personal information.

I would like to thank my Judiciary Committee colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), for introducing this bipartisan resolution; and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 960.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to be the sponsor of this legislation. Stalking is described as repeated harassment or threatening behavior toward somebody else. The stalker can be a stranger or someone the victim knows very well—an ex-partner, a family member. Laws vary from State to State, but stalking is usually considered under the law to be any unwanted contact between the stalker and the victim, that he or she either directly or indirectly communicates a threat or places fear in the victim. Some examples include, but are not limited to, unwanted phone calls; letters; emails; instant messages; following the victim; showing up at the location where the victim is without any reason; leaving unwanted items or presents; and spreading false information or rumors about the victim.

Stalking can turn any ordinary day and any ordinary activity, like walking to your car, into a terrifying experience for the victim. Victims of stalking will never really know if they are safe whether they are at home, in their cars, at their work, or even just walk-

ing down the street. Stalkers show up at the oddest places. They will be sitting out in front of someone's home; they'll be there when the lady drops her child off at school; when she picks him up in the afternoon; when she goes to church. The stalker is everywhere.

One example is a wonderful young lady from Maryland by the name of Yvette Cade. Yvette Cade was severely burned by her husband shortly after a restraining order against him was removed by the judge. Just 3 weeks before, she begged a judge to reinstate a restraining order that had been ordered against her husband. And she told him, the judge, that she feared for her life. But the judge, in his incompetence, refused to reinstate the restraining order. The judge has been reprimanded for that conduct—for refusing to listen to Mrs. Cade's case—which could have prevented the horrible tragedy.

Let me make it clear: when the judge refused to reinstate the restraining order, her husband followed her to the store that she worked in. He walked in the store. He had a bottle of gasoline. He poured it over the top of her head and he set Yvette Cade on fire, all because he had been stalking her, but also a judge had the ability to intervene and prevent that activity—and he did not do so.

Yvette Cade survived those injuries, and she is an advocate for victims' rights to this day. This case is a reminder why we must educate law enforcement and others, including judges, about stalking and domestic violence in order to help them recognize situations as happened to Mrs. Yvette Cade. During a 12-month period, an estimated 3.4 million people ages 18 and older are victims of stalking.

There's a similar story of a woman named Peggy Klinke. She lived in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and broke up with her boyfriend, named Patrick Kennedy, after dating him for 3 years. He couldn't handle not being with Peggy and stalked her outside of her work. He waited for her outside of her gym. He followed her everywhere she went. And she could always find his truck wherever she showed up.

She filed stalking charges against him and had a protective order put out against him. Eventually, Peggy started dating someone else and tried to move on with her life. Patrick set her boyfriend's house on fire and flew to Peggy's mother's house in Ohio and spray painted her house with profanity. The police then thought they had enough evidence to take him to court. Six months before the trial began, Peggy moved to California to hide from Patrick. He hired a private investigator to find her, and he did so in California. Two weeks before the trial, he located her and then killed her and then killed himself.

The most effective way of preventing stalking is making people aware it exists and how dangerous it can be. While not every instance of stalking ends in violence, many do. Stalking must be

taken seriously and decisive measures must be taken by law enforcement officials as soon as the behavior begins in order to prevent the escalation into a violent situation.

House Res. 960 expresses support for the designation of January 2010 as National Stalking Awareness Month to raise awareness and encourage the prevention of stalking. I support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the original author of the national stalking criminal legislation some years ago, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. My colleague, Judge POE, the Representative from Texas, has told you some of the examples about women who have found themselves in this dire situation. We had in my county, Orange County, California, a total of four young women in 1990 who were, in the span of 6 weeks, all confronted by the same situation. They were being stalked by an acquaintance or a former beau, someone they knew. Each knew they were going to be attacked. Each had been threatened that they would be attacked.

I spoke after the attack with a law enforcement officer there who said it was the hardest thing he ever had to do in his life was to tell one of these young women, I know you feel he's going to attack you, but there's nothing we can do until you're physically attacked. Despite the threats he's made, there's nothing we can do. So he said, I took it upon myself to follow this individual because I knew he intended to carry out that attack. He said, I came within 2 minutes of preventing him from killing her. But, unfortunately, he took her life, and then when he saw me, he took his own. This was the example given in this one case, but there were four cases within that 6 weeks in 1990.

I had previously passed legislation in the State senate on terrorism as it related to credible threats made against synagogues and churches by those who threatened to blow up synagogues. And I thought, Well, perhaps we can extend this and actually give law enforcement the chance to step in. Since that other law had been upheld by the State supreme court, perhaps it would uphold a law if we passed an anti-stalker law that said if you threatened the victim with a credible threat of great bodily harm, it became a stalking crime, and thereby perhaps you would have the deterrent effect of having law enforcement able to go to these victims or go, more importantly, to perpetrators and tell them, You may not understand this, but under this new law you face 3 years or more in State prison if you do this.

We passed the legislation in California after some debate. We had particularly effective testimony from one young woman who had been stalked for

years by a high school acquaintance who she didn't even know, and finally taken at knifepoint. There was a 12-hour standoff. But because he didn't drag her more than the allotted number of feet, it was not a kidnapping. So, finally, with her testimony, we got that through the State house.

And then we found that the very advice we were giving these victims—get away from your stalker; move, because there's little we can do—meant that when they moved from the State of California to another State—let's say Florida, an example that I'm familiar with—the restraining order was no longer in effect, which meant that he couldn't be charged with stalking.

So the answer to that was a Federal law. By that time, we had used the California law as a template. We passed it in all 50 States. Japan had adopted the law. Parliaments in Europe adopted the law. But the question was: How do you protect those who go from State to State when those restraining orders are no longer in effect?

So in the United States House of Representatives I introduced that legislation. As a result, this new law provides a uniform Federal law protecting stalking victims when they cross State lines either to travel or work or to get away from their stalkers, or for any other purpose; and when they're on Federal property; if they're on a military base, for example; if they're at a post office.

It was signed into law in 1996. And I will tell you now why I am appreciative of these Members bringing this law up to date, of which I am a cosponsor. Our key problem is getting people aware of the existence of this law. Our key challenge today is deterrence. As mentioned, you have a case today where one out of every four young women who is killed is being murdered by someone who formerly stalked her. And there is a deterrent effect to law enforcement coming to you and saying you could be serving 3 years in a Federal penitentiary or in jail. You've got 3.4 million people being stalked every year, according to the Department of Justice.

□ 1530

If we had those in law enforcement, if judges were more cognizant of the challenges of this problem, we'd be better able to handle this situation.

Many communities have come to understand that stalking is a serious problem. Many have come up with programs that can support victims and combat this crime, but we really need law enforcement to have more focus because how many times can you look at a situation and say, All right. There's something we could have done to help deter this. We know the incidences where that has been effective here.

Most stalkers are known by their victims. It isn't always the case, but most are known.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. POE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And in today's world, stalkers, unfortunately, are using a very new and upgraded type of technology from what, traditionally, they used. It used to be that, you know, they'd leave a message on the phone. Today it's computers, it's GPS units, it's cell phones, it's social networking, and all of this can be used to harass victims.

If anyone would like more information on National Stalking Awareness Month, I urge you to visit [www.stalkingawarenessmonth.org](http://www.stalkingawarenessmonth.org), and try—for those out there in law enforcement—try to understand just how devastating this can be to victims, and try to give them a hand, and try to deter these attacks before they occur.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I will close just after making this statement. My sister Lynnette Maria Johnson was murdered back on May 30, 1973. That happened right here in Washington, D.C.

From high school sweethearts to college, these two individuals, my sister and this gentleman who stalked her and killed her, were an item. But when she went to college, she started meeting new people and her interests changed, and the gentleman just could not take it and so he continued to stalk her. Finally, it resulted in him killing her. At that time, I don't think there were any stalking laws that would have prevented his misconduct, and so I personally have a zero tolerance level for stalkers.

I am proud to support this bill. Representative POE, a trial lawyer and a trial judge who has seen so many cases like these in his career, I'm sure. And Mr. ROYCE of California spoke eloquently on this issue as well. So I want to congratulate him for introducing the Federal legislation that came before this.

I would advise all victims that as soon as it starts happening, let the police know and go get some counseling so that you don't allow this thing to get out of control. If you hit it hard when it first rears up, I think that the chances are much better that the result down the line will be positive and not negative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am ready to yield but I did want to make comments regarding my colleague Mr. JOHNSON.

I appreciate his comments about his family and how stalking violence can happen anywhere in the United States to anybody. We, as a body, must be aware that victims throughout the country go through terrible tragedies in their lives. This legislation brings awareness of stalking to the national front.

Stalking laws are imposed to protect the right to be left alone, and that's a right that all people have in this coun-

try, to be left alone. I want to thank the victims groups that have supported this legislation and, as chairman of the Victims' Rights Caucus, all of the numerous members of the caucus who also support this. I urge its adoption.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2950, "To extend the pilot program for volunteer groups to obtain criminal history background checks and for other purposes, introduced by my distinguished colleague from New York, Senator SCHUMER. "The Criminal History Background Checks Pilot Extension Act of 2009," will be revising the 78-month requirement to a 92-month requirement.

This act is particularly important to protect our children as they participate in so many activities throughout the community.

Mr. POE of Texas. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 960. The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### CRIMINAL HISTORY BACKGROUND CHECKS PILOT EXTENSION ACT OF 2009

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2950) to extend the pilot program for volunteer groups to obtain criminal history background checks.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2950

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Criminal History Background Checks Pilot Extension Act of 2009".

#### SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 108(a)(3)(A) of the PROTECT Act (42 U.S.C. 5119a note) is amended by striking "a 78-month" and inserting "a 92-month".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all



Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 2950, the Criminal History Background Checks Pilot Extension Act of 2009, will extend the national Child Safety Pilot Program for another 14 months. Passed in 2003 as part of the PROTECT Act, the national Child Safety Pilot Program assists organizations in checking the criminal records of volunteers before placing them as mentors with our children. Every year, millions of Americans generously give their time and energy to volunteer and mentor children throughout the country. While the vast majority of these volunteers act out of purely benevolent intentions, it is important that we are able to identify those who may seek to do harm.

Since 2003, the national Child Safety Pilot Program has enabled youth-serving organizations to work with the State governments to access the FBI's national fingerprint-based background checks system. By providing access to the more comprehensive data in the FBI's database, the pilot program has helped prevent child predators and sex offenders from getting access to children through legitimate mentoring programs. Notably, 6 percent of checks came back with serious criminal records.

This is a noncontroversial, fee-based program that we have authorized twice before, Mr. Speaker. It's been extremely successful in providing invaluable information to mentoring organizations, and it's at no cost to the taxpayers. Now we hope that this 14-month extension will give us more time to work with the Department of Justice on permanently authorizing this program.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Child Safety Pilot Program, originally created in 2003 as part of the PROTECT Act, has proven to be a valuable resource for groups that work with children, such as the Boys & Girls Clubs of America, the National Mentoring Partnership, and the National Council of Youth Sports. Using this pilot program, nonprofit organizations that provide youth-focused care, as defined in the National Child Protection Act of 1993, may request criminal history background checks from the FBI on applicants for volunteer or employee positions that involve working with children.

Currently, nearly 68,000 background checks have been administered through the Child Safety Pilot Program. Of

those checks, over 6 percent of all workers screened had criminal records of concern, including serious crimes such as murder, rape, and child assault cases. More than 41 percent of applicants with a criminal record committed crimes in other States other than the one in which they were applying to work as a volunteer. Only a nationwide check, such as the Child Safety Pilot Program, could have provided this information to employers.

A nationwide check is vital to these organization since many of these applicants are looking for work in other States specifically to escape their criminal pasts. That's why I support S. 2950, the Criminal History Background Checks Pilot Extension Act of 2009, which extends this program for 14 more months.

Unfortunately, organizations that work with children are often the targets of those with criminal backgrounds and less than honest intentions. We need to equip these organizations so they can spot individuals with criminal records before it's too late, allowing them to only hire professional and responsible people. S. 2950 extends the Child Safety Pilot Program that has successfully helped these groups and their missions to provide a safe learning environment for children. This is a commonsense piece of legislation that should enjoy widespread support, so I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2950.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### COMMEMORATING 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBERATION OF AUSCHWITZ

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1044) commemorating the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, a Nazi concentration and extermination camp, honoring the victims of the Holocaust, and expressing commitment to strengthen the fight against bigotry and intolerance, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 1044

Whereas during the Holocaust, an estimated 6,000,000 Jews and other targeted groups were murdered by the Nazis and their collaborators;

Whereas, on January 27, 1945, Auschwitz, a Nazi concentration and extermination camp, including Birkenau and other related camps, was liberated by the Soviet Army;

Whereas Auschwitz, located in Poland, was the largest complex of the Nazi concentration and extermination camps;

Whereas according to the Holocaust Memorial Museum, between 1940 and 1945, the Nazis deported at a minimum 1,300,000 people to Auschwitz, and of these, murdered 1,100,000;

Whereas an estimated 960,000 Jews were systematically murdered in Auschwitz during the Holocaust;

Whereas Auschwitz was also used to murder Poles, Roma, Soviet Prisoners of War, those helping to hide Jews and others the Nazis deemed inferior or that held different political views;

Whereas victims of Auschwitz were systematically murdered in gas chambers and many were starved to death, tortured, and subjected to forced labor and criminal medical experiments;

Whereas the complex of the Auschwitz concentration and extermination camp has come to symbolize the mass murder and inhumanity committed during the Holocaust;

Whereas the famous "Arbeit Macht Frei" (Work Will Make You Free) sign over the entrance to Auschwitz was stolen on December 18, 2009, and later recovered and the Polish police arrested the alleged culprits behind the theft;

Whereas according to the Contemporary Global Anti-Semitism Report released by the Department of State's Office of the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism, "[o]ver the last decade, United States embassies and consulates have reported an upsurge in anti-Semitism . . . and that [a]nti-Semitic crimes range from acts of violence, including terrorist attacks against Jews, to the desecration and destruction of Jewish property . . ."; and

Whereas in 2005, United Nations General Assembly resolution 60/7 established January 27, the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, as International Holocaust Remembrance Day for the world to honor the victims of the Holocaust: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commemorates the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz;

(2) honors the victims of Auschwitz and other Nazi concentration and extermination camps, and all those who perished at the hands of the Nazis;

(3) expresses gratitude to the Allied soldiers, underground fighters, and all those whose efforts helped defeat the Nazi regime and liberate Auschwitz and other concentration and extermination camps during World War II;

(4) reaffirms its commitment to enhance Holocaust education at home and abroad and to ensure that what happened in Auschwitz and other Nazi concentration and extermination camps is never allowed to happen again; and

(5) urges all countries to enhance their efforts to combat bigotry, racism, intolerance, and anti-Semitism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Florida (Mr. KLEIN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and yield myself as much time as I may consume.

As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I would like to thank the author of this resolution, my good friend from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for authoring this important statement. This resolution recognizes the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz.

As the many in this Chamber know, Auschwitz was one of several Nazi concentration and extermination camps. Auschwitz served as a death factory of Eastern Europe's Jewish community and many others who were persecuted and murdered by the Nazis. On January 27, 1945, Auschwitz was liberated by Allied Forces, and that day is commemorated around the world as International Day of Holocaust Remembrance.

Today, Auschwitz is a reminder of the consequences of hatred, bigotry, and humanity's worst. The words, "Never again," are a mission, a goal to ensure that humanity never again sinks to those depths. This resolution reminds us of this purpose and focuses our efforts on education and prevention.

This is something that I have personally been working on for many years. As a member of the Florida Senate, I helped pass the first requirement for Holocaust education in public school curriculum. Now, many States have followed suit, and more American children of all walks of life are learning these important lessons.

In Congress, I have learned that Holocaust education can take many forms. Just down the street from the U.S. Capitol is the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Since I've come to Congress, Congressman MIKE PENCE and I have sought to bring new Members of Congress every 2 years to the Holocaust Museum so they can bear witness to this tragic history. They take this knowledge with them and bring it back to their districts across America and use their new understanding to raise awareness of anti-Semitism and bigotry around the world.

I would like to thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN for focusing this resolution on Holocaust education. As the generation of American liberators and Holo-

caust survivors begins to pass away, the mission of education and of "Never again" is more critical than ever.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the many ceremonies that were held last week in honor of International Holocaust Remembrance Day, including one at Auschwitz, attended by Poland's President and Prime Minister, along with education ministers from nearly 30 nations and about 150 Holocaust survivors. At this commemoration, Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu proclaimed, "We will not allow the deniers of the Holocaust . . . to erase or distort the memory [of what happened]." This is our mission as well, and today the House of Representatives should speak with one voice in support of this mission.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of my bill, House Resolution 1044, commemorating this year as the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, the largest of the Nazi extermination camps. Over a million people were systematically tortured and brutally murdered there. The Nazis at Auschwitz conducted cruel medical experiments on prisoners, including children. They intentionally infected prisoners with diseases and performed forced sterilizations and castrations on adults.

Most of those who perished at Auschwitz were Jews. But others that the Nazis perceived as enemies or inferior to Hitler's Aryan image were also murdered at Auschwitz. It was hell on Earth. Leo Schneiderman, a Holocaust survivor said the following about his arrival at Auschwitz, and I quote: "When we came in, the minute the gates opened up, we heard screams and barking of dogs, and then we got out of the train. And everything went so fast. Men separated from women. Children torn from the arms of mothers. The elderly chased like cattle. The sick, the disabled were handled like packs of garbage. My mother ran over to me and grabbed me by the shoulders, and she told me, 'Leibele, I'm not going to see you no more. Take care of your brother.'"

After years of misery and suffering, only a few thousands had remained when the Soviet Army arrived on a snowy day in 1945. Most of those survivors were too weak to realize that they had been liberated. We must remember what happened and ensure that humanity always prevails over hateful savagery and oppression.

The resolution we are considering today, Mr. Speaker, commemorates the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz and honors the victims who perished at the hands of the Nazis. It expresses gratitude to the people whose efforts helped defeat the Nazi regime.

It reaffirms the commitment of the House to bolster Holocaust education here in the United States and abroad, and to ensure that what happened during the Holocaust is never allowed to happen again.

And it also urges all countries to enhance their efforts to fight bigotry, racism, intolerance, and anti-Semitism. We must heed the lessons of history, remain vigilant, and stand firmly against purveyors of hatred who incite to violence against Israel, against the Jewish people, and all of us who stand for liberty and the fundamental rights of all human beings. As Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu said at a ceremony last week which marked the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, and I quote: "We will always remember what the Nazi Amalek did to us, and we won't forget to be prepared for the new Amalek, who is making an appearance on the stage of history and once again threatening to destroy the Jews. We will not take this lightly and believe that these are empty statements. We will never forget and always remember to stand guard."

So as we commemorate the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, I urge my colleagues to keep those words in mind and work to support and ensure that the world will never again see another Holocaust. I would also like to use this opportunity to say that I will be introducing a bill this week that will open the door for Holocaust survivors to bring Holocaust-era insurance claims against insurance companies in the U.S. courts. This bill will force insurance companies to disclose the names of Holocaust insurance policy holders.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to render their full support to this resolution.

I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, a member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. POE of Texas. Auschwitz was one of several if not many concentration camps that were established by the Nazis. In 1945, a young, 18-year old teenager who'd never been more than 50 miles from home showed up, along with other members of the Seventh Army, at a place called Dachau in Germany, and he helped liberate that concentration camp. That camp had been open from 1933 to 1945, where scientific experiments were done on people, ordered by the Nazis. This was the first concentration camp in Germany. That 18-year old that helped liberate that camp was my father. And he never talked much about World War II. But from time to time, even to this day, he mentions the word Dachau because that had such a tremendous impact on him.

I have had the opportunity, along with my son Kurt, to go to Germany to

see this place where people were tortured, humiliated, and murdered by the Nazis. Auschwitz was one. There are many others. And yet we should remember all the places where people were tortured in the name of hate, and we should remember the survivors of these concentration camps, and we should remember them forever.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Trade.

Mr. ROYCE. I rise in support of this resolution commemorating the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz. I'm an original cosponsor of this bill. But I'd like to thank the author of this resolution, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Chairman BERMAN as well for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, during World War II, my father was part of the Allied Forces who liberated Dachau. It was a concentration camp of similar horrors to that of Auschwitz, as Mr. POE expressed. And when they took the camp, he took pictures to document the tragedy, to document the horror of what he witnessed, and he has used them ever since, even to this day, in terms of lecturing to high school classes.

Mr. Speaker, importantly, we are marking this anniversary. We do so to remember the Holocaust and its victims. Inevitably the refrain "Never Again" comes to our lips. But, unfortunately, we know that this type of terror continues. Maybe not on the magnitude that it occurred during the Holocaust, but in the North Korean police state, where 200,000 are held in a system of political concentration camps which are modern day gulags, and the pictures of those imprisoned in North Korea, malnourished, with striped pajamas, are jarringly familiar to those of us who saw those photographs, either at Dachau or at Auschwitz.

Of course, like Nazi Germany, many of the regimes that have no respect for their own, like North Korea, are hostile also to us. High school students my father has lectured about World War II often ask why the world was so asleep to Adolf Hitler's horrors. Of course the world was only slowly learning about the depth of what was occurring in camps like Auschwitz. But with respect to today's tragedies, we don't have such an excuse.

Mr. Speaker, on the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, all of us, Congress and the administration, can resolve to do more in the cause of freedom, to do more to commit the United States to make certain that nothing like the Holocaust ever occurs again. And we can do more to remember the victims of that senseless slaughter.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and we yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady and the speakers

this afternoon on this very important resolution. I urge Members of this Chamber to support this resolution and send a strong message worldwide, never again.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, the Auschwitz concentration camp serves as a tragic reminder of the millions of innocent men, women and children who lost their lives in the Holocaust. Yet it also is a standing testament to all those who risked their own lives to defeat the Nazi regime.

I would like to thank the Ranking Member, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I am proud to cosponsor H. Res. 1044, a resolution commemorating the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz.

On January 27, 1945, Allied Forces liberated the Auschwitz concentration camp where victims were systematically murdered in gas chambers, starved, tortured and subjected to forced labor and cruel medical experiments. According to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, over one million people lost their lives at Auschwitz.

Auschwitz was the largest Nazi concentration and extermination camp, and its buildings have come to symbolize the sheer inhumanity of the Holocaust. As we mark the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, let us recommit ourselves to combating bigotry, racism, intolerance and anti-Semitism.

As the co-chair of the Congressional Anti-Semitism Caucus, I stand in support of the resolution. With its passage, we remember the truth of the Holocaust and say with one resounding voice, "Never again!"

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1044, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE TIM HOLDEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable TIM HOLDEN, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
January 27, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to rule VIII of the

rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with an administrative subpoena, issued before the Environmental Hearing Board of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for documents. This is in reference to the landfill in Blythe Township, Pennsylvania which I opposed due to environmental concerns.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

TIM HOLDEN,  
Member of Congress.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM PROJECTS DIRECTOR, THE HONORABLE TIM HOLDEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from William Hanley, projects director, the Honorable TIM HOLDEN, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
January 27, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with an administrative subpoena, issued before the Environmental Hearing Board of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for documents.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to notify the party that issued the subpoena that I have no responsive documents.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM HANLEY,  
Projects Director.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 1, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Monday, February 1, 2010 at 2:47 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby submits his Budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2011.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,  
Clerk of the House.

#### BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-82)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message

from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

We begin a new year at a moment of continuing challenge for the American people. Even as we recover from crisis, millions of families are still feeling the pain of lost jobs and savings. Businesses are still struggling to find affordable loans to expand and hire workers. Our Nation is still experiencing the consequences of a deep and lasting recession, even as we have seen encouraging signs that the turmoil of the past 2 years is waning. Moving from recession to recovery, and ultimately to prosperity, remains at the heart of my Administration's efforts. This Budget provides a blueprint for the work ahead.

But in order to understand where we are going in the coming year, it is important to remember where we started just 1 year ago. Last January, the United States faced an economic crisis unlike any we had known in generations. Irresponsible risk-taking and debt-fueled speculation—unchecked by sound oversight—led to the near-collapse of our financial system. Our Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was falling at the fastest rate in a quarter-century. Five trillion dollars of Americans' household wealth had evaporated in just 12 weeks as stocks, pensions, and home values plummeted. We were losing an average of 700,000 jobs each month, equivalent to the population of the State of Vermont. The capital and credit markets, integral to the normal functioning of our economy, were virtually frozen. The fear among economists—from across the political spectrum—was that we risked sinking into a second Great Depression.

Immediately, we undertook a series of difficult steps to prevent that outcome. We acted to get lending flowing again so that businesses could get loans to buy equipment and ordinary Americans could get financing to buy homes and cars, go to college, and start or run businesses. We enacted measures to foster greater stability in the housing market, help responsible homeowners stay in their homes, and help to stop the broader decline in home values. To achieve this, and to prevent an economic collapse that would have affected millions of additional families, we had no choice but to use authority enacted under the previous Administration to extend assistance to some of the very banks and financial institutions whose actions had helped precipitate the turmoil. We also took steps to prevent the rapid dissolution of the American auto industry—which faced a crisis partly of its own making—to prevent the loss of hundreds of thousands of additional jobs during an already fragile time. Many of these decisions were not popular, but we deemed them necessary to prevent a deeper and longer recession.

Even as we worked to stop the economic freefall and address the crises in our banking sector, our housing market, and our auto industry, we also began attacking the economic crisis on a broader front. Less than 1 month after taking office, we enacted the most sweeping economic recovery package in history: the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The Recovery Act not only provided tax cuts to small businesses and 95 percent of working families and provided emergency relief to those out of work or without health insurance; it also began to lay a new foundation for long-term economic growth and prosperity. With investments in health care, education, infrastructure, and clean energy, the Recovery Act both saved and created millions of jobs and began the hard work of transforming our economy to thrive in the modern, global marketplace and reverse the financial decline working families experienced in the last decade. Because of these and other steps, we can safely say we have avoided the depression many feared, and we are no longer facing the potential collapse of our financial system. But our work is far from complete.

First and foremost, there are still too many Americans without work. The steps we have taken have helped stop the staggering job losses we were experiencing at the beginning of last year. But the damage has been done. More than seven million jobs were lost since the recession began 2 years ago. This represents not only a terrible human tragedy, but also a very deep hole from which we have to climb out. Until our businesses are hiring again and jobs are being created to replace those we have lost—until America is back at work—my Administration will not rest and this recovery will not be finished.

That is why this Budget includes plans to encourage small businesses to hire as quickly and effectively as possible, to make additional investments in infrastructure, and to jump-start clean energy investments that will help the private sector create good jobs in America.

Long before this crisis hit, middle-class families were under growing strain. For decades, Washington failed to address fundamental weaknesses in the economy: rising health-care costs, a growing dependence on foreign oil, and an education system unable to prepare our children for the jobs of the future. In recent years, spending bills and tax cuts for the wealthy were approved without paying for any of it, leaving behind a mountain of debt. And while Wall Street gambled without regard for the consequences, Washington looked the other way.

As a result, the economy may have been working very well for those at the very top, but it was not working for the middle class. Year after year, Americans were forced to work longer hours and spend more time away from their loved ones, while their incomes flat-lined and their sense of economic

security evaporated. Beneath the statistics are the stories of hardship I've heard all across America. For too many, there has long been a sense that the American dream—a chance to make your own way, to support your family, save for college and retirement, own a home—was slipping away. And this sense of anxiety has been combined with a deep frustration that Washington either didn't notice, or didn't care enough to act.

Those days are over. In the aftermath of this crisis, what is clear is that we cannot simply go back to business as usual. We cannot go back to an economy that yielded cycle after cycle of speculative booms and painful busts. We cannot continue to accept an education system in which our students trail their peers in other countries, and a health-care system in which exploding costs put our businesses at a competitive disadvantage and squeeze the incomes of our workers. We cannot continue to ignore the clean energy challenge and stand still while other countries move forward in the emerging industries of the 21st Century. And we cannot continue to borrow against our children's future, or allow special interests to determine how public dollars are spent. That is why, as we strive to meet the crisis of the moment, we are continuing to lay a new foundation for the future.

Already, we have made historic strides to reform and improve our schools, to pass health insurance reform, to build a new clean energy economy, to cut wasteful spending, and to limit the influence of lobbyists and special interests so that we are better serving the national interest. However, there is much left to do, and this Budget lays out the way ahead.

Because an educated workforce is essential in a 21st Century global economy, we are undertaking a reform of elementary and secondary school funding by setting high standards, encouraging innovation, and rewarding success; making the successful Race to the Top fund permanent and opening it up to innovative school districts; investing in educating the next generation of scientists and engineers; and putting our Nation closer to meeting the goal of leading the world in new college graduates by 2020. Moreover, since in today's economy learning must last a lifetime, my Administration will reform the job-training system, streamlining it and focusing it on the high-growth sectors of the economy.

Because even the best-trained workers in the world can't compete if our businesses are saddled with rapidly increasing health-care costs, we're fighting to reform our Nation's broken health insurance system and relieve this unsustainable burden. My Budget includes funds to lay the groundwork for these reforms—by investing in health information technology, patient-centered research, and prevention and wellness—as well as to improve the health of the Nation by increasing the

number of primary care physicians, protecting the safety of our food and drugs, and investing in critical biomedical research.

Because small businesses are critical creators of new jobs and economic growth, the Budget eliminates capital gains taxes for investments in small firms and includes measures to increase these firms' access to the loans they need to meet payroll, expand their operations, and hire new workers.

Because we know the nation that leads in clean energy will be the nation that leads the world, the Budget creates the incentives to build a new clean energy economy—from new loan guarantees that will encourage a range of renewable energy efforts and new nuclear power plants to spurring the development of clean energy on Federal lands. More broadly, the Budget makes critical investments that will ensure that we continue to lead the world in new fields and industries: doubling research and development funding in key physical sciences agencies; expanding broadband networks across our country; and working to promote American exports abroad.

And because we know that our future is dependent on maintaining American leadership abroad and ensuring our security at home, the Budget funds all the elements of our national power—including our military—to achieve our goals of winding down the war in Iraq, executing our new strategy in Afghanistan, and fighting al Qaeda all over the world. To honor the sacrifice of the men and women who shoulder this burden and who have throughout our history, the Budget also provides significant resources, including advanced appropriations, to care for our Nation's veterans.

Rising to these challenges is the responsibility we bear for the future of our children, our grandchildren, and our Nation. This is an obligation to change not just what we do in Washington, but how we do it.

As we look to the future, we must recognize that the era of irresponsibility in Washington must end. On the day my Administration took office, we faced an additional \$7.5 trillion in national debt by the end of this decade as a result of the failure to pay for two large tax cuts, primarily for the wealthiest Americans, and a new entitlement program. We also inherited the worst recession since the Great Depression—which, even before we took any action, added an additional \$3 trillion to the national debt. Our response to this recession, the Recovery Act, which has been critical to restoring economic growth, will add an additional \$1 trillion to the debt—only 10 percent of these costs. In total, the surpluses we enjoyed at the start of the last decade have disappeared; instead, we are \$12 trillion deeper in debt. In the long term, we cannot have sustainable and durable economic growth without getting our fiscal house in order.

That is why even as we increased our short-term deficit to rescue the econ-

omy, we have refused to go along with business as usual, taking responsibility for every dollar we spend, eliminating what we don't need, and making the programs we do need more efficient. We are taking on health care—the single biggest threat to our Nation's fiscal future—and doing so in a fiscally responsible way that will not add a dime to our deficits and will lower the rate of health-care cost growth in the long run.

We are implementing the Recovery Act with an unprecedented degree of oversight and openness so that anyone anywhere can see where their tax dollars are going. We've banned lobbyists from serving on agency advisory boards and commissions, which had become dominated by special interests. We are using new technology to make Government more accessible to the American people. And last year, we combed the budget, cutting millions of dollars of waste and eliminating excess wherever we could—including outdated weapons systems that even the Pentagon said it did not want or need.

We continued that process in this Budget as well, streamlining what does work and ending programs that do not—all while making it more possible for Americans to judge our progress for themselves. The Budget includes more than 120 programs for termination, reduction, or other savings for a total of approximately \$23 billion in 2011, as well as an aggressive effort to reduce the tens of billions of dollars in improper Government payments made each year.

To help put our country on a fiscally sustainable path, we will freeze non-security discretionary funding for 3 years. This freeze will require a level of discipline with Americans' tax dollars and a number of hard choices and painful tradeoffs not seen in Washington for many years. But it is what needs to be done to restore fiscal responsibility as we begin to rebuild our economy.

In addition to closing loopholes that allow wealthy investment managers to not pay income taxes on their earnings and ending subsidies for big oil, gas, and coal companies, the Budget eliminates the Bush tax cuts for those making more than \$250,000 a year and devotes those resources instead to reducing the deficit. Our Nation could not afford these tax cuts when they passed, and it cannot afford them now.

And the Budget calls for those in the financial sector—who benefited so greatly from the extraordinary measures taken to rescue them from a crisis that was largely of their own making—to finally recognize their obligation to taxpayers. The legislation establishing the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) included a provision requiring the Administration to devise a way for these banks and firms to pay back the American taxpayer. That is why in this Budget we have included a fee on the largest and most indebted financial firms to ensure that taxpayers are fully compensated for the extraor-

dinary support they provided, while providing a deterrent to the risky practices that contributed to this crisis.

Yet even after taking these steps, our fiscal situation remains unacceptable. A decade of irresponsible choices has created a fiscal hole that will not be solved by a typical Washington budget process that puts partisanship and parochial interests above our shared national interest. That is why, working with the Congress, we will establish a bipartisan fiscal commission charged with identifying additional policies to put our country on a fiscally sustainable path—balancing the Budget, excluding interest payments on the debt, by 2015.

This past year, we have seen the consequences of those in power failing to live up to their responsibilities to shareholders and constituents. We have seen how Main Street is as linked to Wall Street as our economy is to those of other nations. And we have seen the results of building an economy on a shaky foundation, rather than on the bedrock fundamentals of innovation, small business, good schools, smart investment, and long-term growth.

We have also witnessed the resilience of the American people—our unique ability to pick ourselves up and forge ahead even when times are tough. All across our country, there are students ready to learn, workers eager to work, scientists on the brink of discovery, entrepreneurs seeking the chance to open a small business, and once-shuttered factories just waiting to whir back to life in burgeoning industries.

This is a Nation ready to meet the challenges of this new age and to lead the world in this new century. Americans are willing to work hard, and, in return, they expect to be able to find a good job, afford a home, send their children to world-class schools, receive high-quality and affordable health care, and enjoy retirement security in their later years. These are the building blocks of the middle class that make America strong, and it is our duty to honor the drive, ingenuity, and fortitude of the American people by laying the groundwork upon which they can pursue these dreams and realize the promise of American life.

This Budget is our plan for how to start accomplishing this in the coming fiscal year. As we look back on the progress of the past 12 months and look forward to the work ahead, I have every confidence that we can—and will—rise to the challenge that our people and our history set for us.

These have been tough times, and there will be difficult months ahead. But the storms of the past are receding; the skies are brightening; and the horizon is beckoning once more.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 1, 2010.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1831

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. QUIGLEY) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4061, CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-410) on the resolution (H. Res. 1051) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4061) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4495, House Resolution 957, and House Resolution 1014, in each case by the yeas and nays.

Remaining postponed questions will be taken later in the week.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

#### JIM KOLBE POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4495, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4495.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—390

Abercrombie	Bachmann	Berry
Ackerman	Bachus	Biggart
Aderholt	Baird	Bilbray
Adler (NJ)	Baldwin	Bilirakis
Akin	Barrow	Bishop (GA)
Alexander	Bartlett	Bishop (NY)
Altmire	Barton (TX)	Bishop (UT)
Andrews	Bean	Blackburn
Arcuri	Becerra	Blumenauer
Austria	Berkley	Blunt
Baca	Berman	Bocchieri

Boehner	Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Bonner	Gohmert	McCarthy (NY)
Bono Mack	Gonzalez	McCaull
Boozman	Goodlatte	McClintock
Boren	Gordon (TN)	McCollum
Boswell	Granger	McCotter
Boucher	Graves	McDermott
Boustany	Grayson	McGovern
Brady (PA)	Green, Al	McHenry
Braley (IA)	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Bright	Griffith	McKeon
Broun (GA)	Guthrie	McMahon
Brown (SC)	Hall (TX)	McMorris
Brown, Corrine	Halvorson	Rodgers
Brown-Waite,	Hare	McNerney
Ginny	Harman	Meek (FL)
Buchanan	Harper	Meeks (NY)
Burgess	Hastings (FL)	Mica
Burton (IN)	Hastings (WA)	Michaud
Butterfield	Heinrich	Miller (FL)
Buyer	Heller	Miller (MI)
Calvert	Hensarling	Miller (NC)
Camp	Hergert	Miller, Gary
Campbell	Herseth Sandlin	Miller, George
Cantor	Higgins	Minnick
Cao	Hill	Mitchell
Capito	Himes	Mollohan
Capps	Hinchee	Moore (KS)
Capuano	Hinojosa	Moore (WI)
Cardoza	Hirono	Moran (VA)
Carnahan	Hodes	Murphy (CT)
Carson (IN)	Holden	Murphy (NY)
Carter	Holt	Murphy, Patrick
Castle	Honda	Murphy, Tim
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Myrick
Chaffetz	Hunter	Nadler (NY)
Chandler	Inglis	Napolitano
Childers	Inslee	Neal (MA)
Chu	Israel	Neugebauer
Clarke	Issa	Nunes
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Nye
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Oberstar
Clyburn	(TX)	Obey
Coble	Jenkins	Olson
Coffman (CO)	Johnson (GA)	Oliver
Cohen	Johnson (IL)	Ortiz
Cole	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Pallone
Connolly (VA)	Jones	Pascarell
Conyers	Jordan (OH)	Pastor (AZ)
Cooper	Kanjorski	Paul
Costello	Kaptur	Payne
Courtney	Kennedy	Pence
Crenshaw	Kildee	Perlmutter
Crowley	Kilpatrick (MI)	Perriello
Cuellar	Kilroy	Peters
Culberson	Kind	Peterson
Cummings	King (IA)	Petri
Dahlkemper	King (NY)	Pingree (ME)
Davis (CA)	Kingston	Pitts
Davis (KY)	Kissell	Platts
Davis (TN)	Klein (FL)	Poe (TX)
DeFazio	Kline (MN)	Polis (CO)
DeGette	Kosmas	Pomeroy
Delahunt	Kratovil	Posey
DeLauro	Kucinich	Price (GA)
Dent	Lamborn	Price (NC)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lance	Putnam
Diaz-Balart, M.	Langevin	Quigley
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Rahall
Dingell	Latham	Rangel
Doggett	LaTourette	Rehberg
Donnelly (IN)	Latta	Reichert
Dreier	Lee (CA)	Reyes
Driehaus	Lee (NY)	Richardson
Duncan	Levin	Rodriguez
Edwards (MD)	Lewis (CA)	Roe (TN)
Edwards (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Ellsworth	Linder	Rogers (KY)
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)
Etheridge	Lofgren, Zoe	Rooney
Fallin	Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen
Farr	Lucas	Roskam
Fattah	Luetkemeyer	Ross
Filner	Lujan	Rothman (NJ)
Flake	Lummis	Roybal-Allard
Fleming	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Forbes	E.	Ruppersberger
Fortenberry	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Foster	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Fox	Maffei	Salazar
Frank (MA)	Maloney	Sanchez, Loretta
Franks (AZ)	Manzullo	Sarbanes
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Scalise
Fudge	Markley (CO)	Schauer
Galleghy	Markey (MA)	Schiff
Garamendi	Matheson	Schmidt
Gerlach	Matsui	Schock
Giffords		Schrader

Schwartz	Spratt	Velázquez
Scott (GA)	Stearns	Visclosky
Scott (VA)	Stupak	Walden
Sensenbrenner	Sullivan	Walz
Serrano	Sutton	Wamp
Sessions	Tanner	Wasserman
Sestak	Taylor	Schultz
Shadegg	Teague	Watson
Shea-Porter	Terry	Watt
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Waxman
Shuler	Thompson (MS)	Weiner
Shuster	Thompson (PA)	Westmoreland
Simpson	Thornberry	Whitfield
Sires	Tiberi	Wilson (OH)
Skelton	Tierney	Wilson (SC)
Slaughter	Titus	Wittman
Smith (NE)	Tonko	Wolf
Smith (NJ)	Towns	Woolsey
Smith (TX)	Tsongas	Wu
Snyder	Turner	Yarmuth
Space	Upton	Young (AK)
Speier	Van Hollen	

#### NOT VOTING—43

Barrett (SC)	Grijalva	Radanovich
Boyd	Gutierrez	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Hall (NY)	Rush
Carney	Hoekstra	Sánchez, Linda
Cassidy	Kagen	T.
Costa	Kirk	Schakowsky
Davis (AL)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Shimkus
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Deal (GA)	Lipinski	Souder
Doyle	Loebach	Stark
Ehlers	Massa	Tiahrt
Ellison	Melancon	Waters
Emerson	Moran (KS)	Welch
Engel	Murtha	Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ)	Paulsen	

□ 1858

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HONORING JIMMIE JOHNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 957, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 957.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—391

Abercrombie	Becerra	Boswell
Ackerman	Berkley	Boucher
Aderholt	Berman	Boustany
Adler (NJ)	Berry	Brady (PA)
Akin	Biggart	Braley (IA)
Alexander	Bilbray	Bright
Altmire	Bilirakis	Broun (GA)
Andrews	Bishop (GA)	Brown (SC)
Arcuri	Bishop (NY)	Brown, Corrine
Austria	Bishop (UT)	Brown-Waite,
Baca	Blackburn	Ginny
Bachmann	Blumenauer	Buchanan
Bachus	Blunt	Burgess
Baird	Bocchieri	Burton (IN)
Baldwin	Boehner	Butterfield
Barrow	Bonner	Buyer
Bartlett	Bono Mack	Calvert
Barton (TX)	Boozman	Camp
Bean	Boren	Campbell



Cantor	Higgins	Miller, George	Stupak	Tonko	Watt	Calvert	Herseth Sandlin	Miller, Gary
Cao	Hill	Minnick	Sullivan	Towns	Waxman	Campbell	Higgins	Miller, George
Capito	Himes	Mitchell	Sutton	Tsongas	Weiner	Cantor	Hill	Minnick
Capps	Hinchev	Mollohan	Tanner	Turner	Welch	Cao	Himes	Mitchell
Capuano	Hinojosa	Moore (KS)	Moore (WI)	Taylor	Westmoreland	Capito	Hinchev	Mollohan
Cardoza	Hirono	Moore (WI)	Teague	Van Hollen	Whitfield	Capps	Hinojosa	Moore (KS)
Carnahan	Hodes	Moran (VA)	Terry	Velázquez	Wilson (OH)	Capuano	Hirono	Moore (WI)
Carson (IN)	Holden	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (CA)	Visclosky	Wilson (SC)	Cardoza	Hodes	Moran (VA)
Carter	Holt	Murphy (NY)	Thompson (MS)	Walden	Wittman	Carnahan	Holden	Murphy (CT)
Castle	Honda	Murphy, Patrick	Thompson (PA)	Walz	Wolf	Carson (IN)	Holt	Murphy (NY)
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Murphy, Tim	Thornberry	Wamp	Woolsey	Carter	Honda	Murphy, Patrick
Chaffetz	Hunter	Myrick	Tiberi	Wasserman	Wu	Castle	Hoyer	Murphy, Tim
Chandler	Inglis	Nadler (NY)	Tierney	Schultz	Yarmuth	Castor (FL)	Hunter	Myrick
Childers	Inslee	Napolitano	Titus	Watson	Young (AK)	Chaffetz	Inglis	Nadler (NY)
Chu	Israel	Neal (MA)				Chandler	Inslee	Napolitano
Clarke	Issa	Neugebauer				Childers	Israel	Neal (MA)
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Nunes				Chu	Issa	Neugebauer
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Nye				Clarke	Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Clyburn	(TX)	Oberstar				Clay	Jackson Lee	Nye
Coble	Jenkins	Obey				Clyburn	(TX)	Oberstar
Coffman (CO)	Johnson (GA)	Olson	Barrett (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Paulsen	Coble	Jenkins	Obey
Cohen	Johnson (IL)	Oliver	Boyd	Grijalva	Radanovich	Coffman (CO)	Johnson (GA)	Olson
Cole	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz	Brady (TX)	Gutierrez	Rohrabacher	Cohen	Johnson (IL)	Oliver
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Owens	Carney	Hall (NY)	Rush	Cole	Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz
Connolly (VA)	Jones	Pallone	Cassidy	Hoekstra	Sánchez, Linda	Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Owens
Conyers	Jordan (OH)	Pascarell	Kagen	Kirk	T.	Connolly (VA)	Jones	Pallone
Cooper	Kanjorski	Pastor (AZ)	Davis (AL)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Schakowsky	Conyers	Jordan (OH)	Pascarell
Costello	Kaptur	Paul	Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Shimkus	Cooper	Kanjorski	Pastor (AZ)
Courtney	Kennedy	Payne	Deal (GA)	Lipinski	Smith (WA)	Costello	Kaptur	Paul
Crenshaw	Kildee	Pence	Doyle	Loeb sack	Souder	Courtney	Kennedy	Payne
Crowley	Kilpatrick (MI)	Perlmutter	Ehlers	Massa	Stark	Crenshaw	Kildee	Pence
Cuellar	Kilroy	Perriello	Ellison	Moran (KS)	Tiahrt	Crowley	Kilpatrick (MI)	Perlmutter
Culberson	Kind	Peters	Emerson	Murtha	Waters	Cuellar	Kilroy	Perriello
Cummings	King (IA)	Peterson	Engel		Young (FL)	Culberson	Kind	Peters
Dahlkemper	King (NY)	Petri				Cummings	King (IA)	Peterson
Davis (CA)	Kingston	Pingree (ME)				Dahlkemper	King (NY)	Petri
Davis (KY)	Kissell	Pitts				Davis (CA)	Kingston	Pingree (ME)
Davis (TN)	Klein (FL)	Platts				Davis (KY)	Kissell	Pitts
DeFazio	Kline (MN)	Poe (TX)				Davis (TN)	Klein (FL)	Platts
DeGette	Kosmas	Polis (CO)				DeGette	Kline (MN)	Poe (TX)
Delahunt	Kratovil	Pomeroy				DeLauro	Kosmas	Polis (CO)
DeLauro	Kucinich	Posey				Delahunt	Kratovil	Pomeroy
Dent	Lamborn	Price (GA)				Dent	Kucinich	Posey
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lance	Price (NC)				Diaz-Balart, L.	Lamborn	Price (GA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Langevin	Putnam				Diaz-Balart, M.	Lance	Price (NC)
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Quigley				Dicks	Langevin	Putnam
Dingell	Rahall	Rahall				Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Quigley
Doggett	LaTourette	Rangel				Doggett	Latham	Rahall
Donnelly (IN)	Latta	Rehberg				Donnelly (IN)	LaTourette	Rangel
Dreier	Lee (CA)	Reichert				Dreier	Latta	Rehberg
Driehaus	Lee (NY)	Reyes				Driehaus	Lee (CA)	Reichert
Duncan	Levin	Richardson				Duncan	Lee (NY)	Reyes
Edwards (MD)	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez				Edwards (MD)	Levin	Richardson
Edwards (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Roe (TN)				Edwards (TX)	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez
Ellsworth	Linder	Rogers (AL)				Ellsworth	Lewis (GA)	Roe (TN)
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)				Engel	Linder	Rogers (AL)
Etheridge	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (MI)				Eshoo	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)
Fallin	Lowey	Rooney				Etheridge	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (MI)
Farr	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen				Fallin	Lowey	Rooney
Fattah	Luetkemeyer	Roskam				Farr	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen
Filner	Luján	Ross				Fattah	Luetkemeyer	Roskam
Flake	Lummis	Rothman (NJ)				Filner	Luján	Ross
Fleming	Lungren, Daniel	Roybal-Allard				Flake	Lummis	Rothman (NJ)
Forbes	E.	Royce				Fleming	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Fortenberry	Lynch	Ruppersberger				Forbes	E.	Ruppersberger
Foster	Mack	Ryan (OH)				Fortenberry	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Fox	Maffei	Ryan (WI)				Foster	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Frank (MA)	Maloney	Salazar				Fox	Maffei	Salazar
Franks (AZ)	Manzullo	Sanchez, Loretta				Frank (MA)	Maloney	Sanchez, Loretta
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Sarbanes				Franks (AZ)	Manzullo	Sarbanes
Fudge	Markey (CO)	Scalise				Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Scalise
Gallegly	Markey (MA)	Schauer				Fudge	Markey (CO)	Schauer
Garamendi	Marshall	Schiff				Gallegly	Markey (MA)	Schiff
Gerlach	Matheson	Schmidt				Garamendi	Marshall	Schmidt
Giffords	Matsui	Schock				Gerlach	Matheson	Schock
Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Schwartz				Giffords	Matsui	Schwartz
Gohmert	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (GA)				Gingrey (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Schradler
Gonzalez	McCaul	Scott (VA)				Gohmert	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Goodlatte	McClintock	Sensenbrenner				Gonzalez	McCaul	Scott (GA)
Gordon (TN)	McCollum	Serrano				Goodlatte	McClintock	Scott (VA)
Granger	McCotter	Sessions				Gordon (TN)	McCollum	Sensenbrenner
Graves	McDermott	Sestak				Granger	McCotter	Serrano
Grayson	McGovern	Shadegg				Graves	McDermott	Sessions
Green, Al	McHenry	Shea-Porter				Grayson	McGovern	Sestak
Green, Gene	McIntyre	Sherman				Green, Al	McHenry	Shadegg
Griffith	McKeon	Shuler				Green, Gene	McIntyre	Shea-Porter
Guthrie	McMahon	Shuster				Griffith	McKeon	Sherman
Hall (TX)	McMorris	Simpson				Guthrie	McMahon	Shuler
Halvorson	Rodgers	Sires				Halvorson	McMorris	Shuster
Hare	McNerney	Skelton				Hare	Rodgers	Simpson
Harman	Meek (FL)	Slaughter				Harman	McNerney	Sires
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (NE)				Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Skelton
Hastings (WA)	Melancon	Smith (NJ)				Harper	Meeks (NY)	Slaughter
Heinrich	Mica	Smith (TX)				Hastings (WA)	Melancon	Smith (NE)
Heller	Michaud	Snyder				Heinrich	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Space				Heller	Michaud	Smith (TX)
Herger	Miller (MI)	Speier				Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Snyder
Herseth Sandlin	Miller (NC)	Spratt				Herger	Miller (MI)	Space
	Miller, Gary	Stearns					Miller (NC)	Speier

## NAYS—1

## NOT VOTING—41

Barrett (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Paulsen
Boyd	Grijalva	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Gutierrez	Rohrabacher
Carney	Hall (NY)	Rush
Cassidy	Hoekstra	Sánchez, Linda
Kagen	T.	
Davis (AL)	Kirk	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Shimkus
Deal (GA)	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Doyle	Lipinski	Souder
Ehlers	Loeb sack	Stark
Ellison	Massa	Tiahrt
Emerson	Moran (KS)	Waters
Engel	Murtha	Young (FL)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes to vote.

□ 1907

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NORTH AMERICAN INCLUSION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1014, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Towns) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1014.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—389

Abercrombie	Bean	Boozman
Ackerman	Becerra	Boren
Aderholt	Berkley	Boswell
Adler (NJ)	Berman	Boucher
Akin	Berry	Boustany
Alexander	Biggart	Brady (PA)
Altmire	Bilbray	Braley (IA)
Andrews	Bilirakis	Bright
Arcuri	Bishop (GA)	Brown (GA)
Austria	Bishop (NY)	Brown (SC)
Baca	Bishop (UT)	Brown, Corrine
Bachmann	Blackburn	Brown-Waite,
Bachus	Blumenauer	Ginny
Baird	Blunt	Buchanan
Baldwin	Bocciari	Burgess
Barrow	Boehner	Burton (IN)
Bartlett	Bonner	Butterfield
Barton (TX)	Bono Mack	Buyer

Spratt	Tierney	Watt
Stearns	Titus	Waxman
Stupak	Tonko	Weiner
Sullivan	Towns	Welch
Sutton	Tsongas	Westmoreland
Tanner	Turner	Whitfield
Taylor	Upton	Wilson (OH)
Teague	Van Hollen	Wilson (SC)
Terry	Velázquez	Wittman
Thompson (CA)	Visclosky	Wolf
Thompson (MS)	Walden	Woolsey
Thompson (PA)	Walz	Wu
Thornberry	Wamp	Yarmuth
Tiberi	Watson	Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—44

Barrett (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Rohrabacher
Boyd	Grijalva	Rush
Brady (TX)	Gutierrez	Sánchez, Linda
Camp	Hall (NY)	T.
Carney	Hoekstra	Schakowsky
Cassidy	Kagen	Shimkus
Cleaver	Kirk	Smith (WA)
Costa	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Souder
Davis (AL)	Larson (CT)	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Tiahrt
Deal (GA)	Loeb sack	Wasserman
DeFazio	Massa	Schultz
Doyle	Moran (KS)	Waters
Ehlers	Murtha	Young (FL)
Ellison	Paulsen	
Emerson	Radanovich	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes to vote.

□ 1914

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this Chamber this evening. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 26, 27 and 28.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 26, 27, and 28, I was unavoidably detained and missed the votes. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes Nos. 26, 27, and 28.

## PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT IN THE 111TH CONGRESS

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 1050 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1050

*Resolved,*

## SECTION 1. AMOUNTS FOR COMMITTEE EXPENSES.

For further expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the "Committee") for the One Hundred Eleventh Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives not more than \$600,000.

## SEC. 2. SESSION LIMITATION.

The amount specified in section 1 shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2010, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2011.

## SEC. 3. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the Committee, signed by the Chairman of the Committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

## SEC. 4. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the matter just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 2, 2010.

HON. NANCY PELOSI,  
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Tuesday, February 2, 2010 at 4:58 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits a copy of a notice filed earlier with the Federal Register continuing the national emergency with respect to Côte d'Ivoire first declared by Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,  
Clerk of the House.

## CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CÔTE D'IVOIRE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-90)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United

States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire is to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2010.

The situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire, which has been addressed by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, and subsequent resolutions, has resulted in the massacre of large numbers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and fatal attacks against international peacekeeping forces. In March 2007, the Ouagadougou Political Agreement was signed by the two primary protagonists in Côte d'Ivoire's conflict. Although considerable progress has been made in implementing this agreement, the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire poses a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States.

For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2, 2010.

## NOTICE

## CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN OR IN RELATION TO CÔTE D'IVOIRE

On February 7, 2006, by Executive Order 13396, the President declared a national emergency, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701-1706), to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States constituted by the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire and ordered related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire. The situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire, which has been addressed by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, and subsequent resolutions, has resulted in the

massacre of large numbers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and fatal attacks against international peacekeeping forces. Because the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States, the national emergency declared on February 7, 2006, and the measures adopted on that date to deal with that emergency, must continue in effect beyond February 7, 2010. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing for 1 year the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13396.

This notice shall be published in the Federal Register and transmitted to the Congress.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 2, 2010.

#### HONORING THE SACRIFICE OF NAVY PETTY OFFICER SECOND CLASS XIN QI

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. I rise today to honor the sacrifice of Navy Hospital Petty Officer Second Class Xin Qi, who died in Helmand Province in Afghanistan on the 23rd day of January. Petty Officer Qi was assigned to the Operational Health Support Unit in Dallas, Texas, when he volunteered to deploy to Afghanistan with the Fourth Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion out of Camp Pendleton. He was there for three months in his first tour in Afghanistan when a suicide bomber attacked while he was on a foot patrol in Helmand Province.

Simply 25 years of age, Petty Officer Qi is survived by his mother and his father. They are residents of my county, Shelby County, and he is the third casualty from Shelby County in the last few months and the second this year in Operation Enduring Freedom. We've had 13 heroic soldiers die in the Middle East since 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this House take a moment to remember the sacrifices of our Armed Forces, including the ultimate sacrifice of Petty Officer Xin Qi. I thank the family for their wonderful son and the sacrifice he's made for his country.

#### A PLEA FOR HELP

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask House Members within my voice maybe for some help. About three or 4 years ago we found a man in Savannah, Georgia, who's in his late forties, maybe early fifties, who does not have identity. We have no idea who he is or

where he came from. But he is an intelligent, apparently college-educated, middle management type guy, maybe from Indiana. Mr. BURTON actually helped us on him a little bit because he has memories of Indiana and Denver, Colorado. We've talked to the FBI. They've done a background check. We've talked to Social Security. They've done a background check. We've gone to many Federal agencies and asked them for their assistance trying to identify this gentleman. He has no Social Security number so he can't get a job. And he is totally in abeyance, basically forced to be homeless if not for the charity of some people who've taken an interest in his case.

So if anybody knows of a way to identify somebody, I would respectfully ask you to please let me know what it is, and I will be glad to follow whatever lead you can give me. And I appreciate that and thank you very much.

#### SEEKING THE RELEASE OF AMERICAN CITIZENS HELD IN IRAN

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, each Nation is sovereign, but across the airwaves of American television today we saw flashed three Americans who have been held by the leadership in Iran, three innocent Americans who crossed, by mistake, on a hike into the sovereign area of Iran. I make a plea today for the President of Iran to release those individuals.

Today he sent a missive, a message to say that he would release them if we release Iranians who are held in American jails. I believe that the right thing to do is to assess the innocence of these Americans, and to be able to engage in diplomacy on setting them free. If there is any cause for any innocent person who happens to be of Iranian descent that is here in the United States jails, I know that our leadership and criminal justice system will engage. But to hold hostage our innocent Americans who, by accident, during a hike, conspicuously crossed over and admitted it was a mistake is a shame on the international front and does not do justice to human rights around the world.

#### TRY KHALID SHEIKH MOHAMMED IN GUANTANAMO

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, the administration made a tragic mistake when it decided to try Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and his confederates in a civilian courtroom in New York City. We now find that they realize there's been a mistake, but we don't know where

they're going to go next. I'll give them a clue: If you didn't have Guantanamo Bay, you'd have to build it. That's the place he should remain. That's the place he should be tried. We should resume the military tribunals where he and his confederates had already indicated they wanted to plead guilty. We should forget this nonsense about bringing them to civilian courts in the United States. If it's too dangerous for New York, if it doesn't make sense for New York, it doesn't make sense for anywhere in the sovereign territory of the United States. Guantanamo is the perfect place for them to remain.

Do not close Guantanamo. Keep them there. Try them there. Give them their meeting with justice there as well.

Mr. Speaker, they're not attacking us because of Guantanamo Bay. They're attacking us because of the Statue of Liberty.

□ 1930

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### THE IRANIAN OPPOSITION PROTESTS ARE TO BE ADMIRER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there's a grim update coming out of the nation of Iran. Last week, the Government of Iran executed two of the 11 people who had been arrested and sentenced to death for peacefully protesting the government. They were hanged. Iran announced yesterday that nine more people sentenced to death will be hanged in the public square.

On Saturday, 16 more protestors went on trial for their lives. Hundreds of people were arrested in December when liberty advocates again protested in the streets of Iran by the thousands and at least eight people were murdered by the government.

What was their crime? Speaking out against the rigged presidential election last June, speaking out against a dictator who murders his own people, Ahmadinejad.

The people reject the Tiny Tyrant of the Desert, Ahmadinejad, and they're killed in the streets and sentenced by the government-controlled courtrooms to die for peacefully objecting to fraudulent elections.

So death by hanging from the Liberty Tree was their fate, but their silent voices are still heard proclaiming freedom throughout the land of Iran. They died martyrs for their country; they died for human dignity; they died alone but not for themselves alone but for every Iranian that believes in the human right of freedom.

Next week on February 11, Iran will mark the 31st anniversary of the Islamic Revolution. The revolution promised the people of Iran liberty, but it has imposed tyranny. The occasion is usually marked by government-run rallies throughout the country, but the leaders of the freedom movement are asking the people to once again risk their lives and stand in opposition to government tyranny and government-controlled rallies.

The government is accused by opposition leaders of executing two protestors to scare the people into silence on the anniversary of the revolution. Now, the Tiny Tyrant in the Desert, Ahmadinejad, says, The Islamic Revolution opened a window to liberty for the human race. What a lie. The Iranian Government doesn't know what the word "liberty" even means.

The head of the Islamic Revolution Guards in Tehran, Brigadier General Hossein Hamedani, warned in the media that the opposition movement would be barred from making an appearance on February 11. He said, "Any voice, color, or gesture which is different from that of the Islamic Revolution and from the Iranians' voice should be driven out of people's marches," saying violators would be "severely dealt with." So much for freedom of speech. So much for freedom to peaceably assemble and protest the government.

Plus, those in the media are being controlled as to what they can report, allowing only government propaganda to be preached to the people. Is this what the Iranian Government calls liberty? This is tyranny by Dictator Ahmadinejad.

The United States should not remain silent about the oppressions of the Iranian people. The next great hope for the world and world peace is that the people of Iran remove their illegitimate regime and put in a government that is duly and legally authorized by the people. The United States should stand with the Iranian people with their request for freedom and let them know we support their voice for freedom over tyranny, liberty over oppression. And while the dictator may kill the body of those freedom fighters, he will not succeed in killing the spirit of freedom that they have proclaimed when they lived.

The Tiny Tyrant of the Desert, Ahmadinejad, is trying to intimidate his people and intimidate the world. He is trying to divert attention away from his unpopular government. He is threatening the world again saying Iran will "deliver a telling blow to global powers on February 11." Could this be a threat? Another advance in Iran's quest for nuclear weapons?

Our quarrel is not with the people of Iran. Our quarrel, the world's quarrel, is with the Government of Iran. The legitimate government of Iran is the world threat to peace. Ahmadinejad and his henchmen are waging internal war against the Iranian people, and he

desires to rage war against other nations. We should join hands with the sons of liberty and the daughters of Iran in protest of tyranny, oppression, and murder in that country.

Iran needs a regime change because a nuclear Iran is not a nuclear option.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IMPROVING WOMEN'S RIGHTS IS THE KEY TO PEACE IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced a new "Women's Action Plan" for Afghanistan last week. I want to praise Secretary Clinton for this critically important initiative because I believe that improving women's rights is one of the important keys to peace in Afghanistan and in many other parts of the world as well.

The action plan includes the following initiatives: improved security for women in Afghanistan; provide girls and women with better education; expand women's access to judicial institutions; improve women's health care; expand economic development opportunities for women; and increase women's participation in the political process in every level of government.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great need for those initiatives because women's rights have been ignored or destroyed in Afghanistan for many years, especially under Taliban rule. In Afghanistan, the lives of girls and women are at risk every single day because many laws actually don't exist to protect women, and there are many laws that actually discriminate against women. It's also important to remember that the health care is so poor in Afghanistan that it has the second highest mortality rate in the world. Hundreds of girls' schools in Afghanistan have also been destroyed by extremists. The list, Mr. Speaker, goes on and on.

But in the United States, we can help. We can help improve the lives of women in Afghanistan. If we do this, it would be a devastating defeat for the violent extremists in that country and a great victory for progress in Afghanistan.

As a State Department official said last week, "Progress is not possible if half a country's population is left behind. Afghan women must not be viewed simply as victims who need to be sheltered. They must be respected and valued as leaders—a reserve of talent that Afghan society needs to draw upon in order to prosper and succeed."

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention just one particular example of how women can help Afghanistan to prosper because when women are allowed to work, they invest up to 90 percent of their earnings in their family and communities. That's twice the rate of men. And it has a powerful multiplier effect.

So, Mr. Speaker, improving the status of women has been a central part of this SMART security platform which I have been urging for Afghanistan. I am convinced that SMART security would do far more to win the hearts and minds of the Afghan people than military action. That's why I have opposed President Obama's plan to send 30,000 more troops to Afghanistan. We don't need more troops. We need a new strategy.

This new strategy must focus on economic development, humanitarian aid, better education and health care, and human rights. We must encourage and we must help the Afghan people to build a better future and show that we, the United States, are on their side. Certainly women's rights must be at the heart of this new strategy. In fact, advancing women's rights might be the most effective anti-terrorist strategy we can have in Afghanistan.

So let's support Secretary Clinton's ideas, suggestions, by empowering the women of Afghanistan. It will help keep them safe and it certainly will keep us safer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### TEN THINGS EVERY AMERICAN SHOULD KNOW ABOUT PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, President Obama, is sending a budget up here that we've just found out about in the last couple of days. It's \$3.8 trillion in the fiscal year beginning October 1, and that's about a 30 percent increase in outlays since 2008: \$3.8 trillion.

The President's budget includes more than \$2 trillion in tax hikes at a time when this economy is really suffering with a nearly 20-percent jump in taxes in the first year alone, and it's going to hit tax increases on small businesses, investors, and families, and it's going to violate the President's campaign pledge.

The President's budget borrows too much from our kids and grandkids. Under the President's budget, the Federal Government will run a record budget deficit of \$1.6 trillion in fiscal

year 2011; and throughout the next decade, the deficit will never go below \$700 billion a year. At the end of the decade in 2020, it will still be over \$1 trillion a year and the national debt's going to double within the next 5 years. We just can't sustain this kind of spending.

This President's proposed spending freeze that he talked about is a step in the right direction, but it's only \$15 billion. \$15 billion out of a budget of \$3.8 trillion is less than a drop in the bucket. So when he talks about freezing spending, that's not going to solve the problem. We need budget caps. We need spending caps that will be continual year in and year out if we're going to get in control of spending.

The President pushed through the stimulus package which ended up costing over a trillion dollars, and it hasn't helped unemployment at all. In fact, he said it was going to be no more than 8 percent, and it went up to 10½ percent and it's still over 10 percent right now.

The President says he wants to have another stimulus package. He calls it a jobs bill. It's going to cost billions of dollars more, and it's not going to create jobs; it's just going to increase the deficit more.

And CBO says that if we pass the energy tax he is talking about because of "climate change," it's going to increase taxes on energy by \$870 billion.

And then to cap everything off, the President continues to want to bring these terrorists to the United States for trial. These people are enemy combatants. As my colleague, DAN LUNGREN of California, talked about a while ago, they should be tried in a military court in Guantanamo where people won't be intimidated by them.

Can you imagine what it would be like to be on a jury with one of those people? Everybody on the jury would be scared to death that their life is at risk if they render a decision to put those people to death or cause them a great deal of harm. So we really need to deal with them as an enemy combatant. We need to deal with them at Guantanamo with a military tribunal and give them the justice that they deserve.

This is what is going on with this administration right now, and I hope that the President might be paying attention—I can't address him because we can't address people outside the Chamber—but if he were listening tonight, I wish he would take all of these things to heart because the American people are very concerned about the direction of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BERKLEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### PRESIDENT OBAMA'S VISION FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to continue the theme that my colleague just had, and that is the President's vision for these United States over the next 10 years. That vision is exemplified in his budget that he brought to Congress yesterday, which, for fiscal year 2011, which doesn't start until October of this coming fall, which spent \$3.8 trillion, a record, it would generate another deficit of \$1.3 trillion in 2011; it would have some \$2 trillion in tax increases over the 10 years; and it would accumulate \$8.5 trillion in cumulative deficits during that 10 years. It would double the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I would argue that that's not much of a vision for America that my grandkids really want to look at and want to see.

To put that in context, if you look at the cumulative deficits during the 8 years of the previous administration, they total \$2 trillion.

□ 1945

To put that in context, if you look at the cumulative deficits during the 8 years of the previous administration, they totaled \$2 trillion, a number that we ought to be embarrassed about. But if you look at the deficit in the first 15 months of the current administration, it is \$1.8 trillion, and we will surpass the \$2 trillion number some time during this second quarter. If you look at just the first quarter deficit under this administration in 2010, in 15 months, it is larger than all but two annual deficits in our Nation's history. Again, Mr. Speaker, that is not a vision for America that my grandchildren would embrace, nor is it one that we ought to embrace on behalf of our grandchildren.

My appeal tonight is to the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee now takes up the President's budget, and I would appeal to my former colleagues on the Budget Committee to simply ignore this flawed vision for America. It is unsustainable, and it is not one that is worthy of us to even consider in the least.

What I would ask the Budget Committee to do instead is to bring forth a budget that truly addresses what I believe is the single greatest threat to our way of life that we face these days, and that is the growth of this govern-

ment as represented by spending growth, 29 percent growth in spending since 2008. And again, that is unsustainable. Our budget colleagues on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker, have the ability to do that. They have the ability to say let's put out a budget that truly does address this threat, this grave threat to our Nation's prosperity.

There are a couple of suggestions I would make. Let's roll back spending to fiscal 2008 levels and start the spending freeze there. Let's put a hiring freeze on today for all Federal Government agencies except perhaps DOD, Homeland Security, and maybe intel communities. That is a true action that every business and every family around this country knows exactly what it means and exactly why we have to do that.

I'm reminded of the folks, and you see them all the time, who are constantly searching for a way to lose weight. They are always looking for that new diet plan, and they are always willing to start, however draconian the plan might be, "tomorrow."

Well, Mr. Speaker, any of us can start a diet tomorrow, but we need a spending diet that starts today. And I ask that our Budget Committee brethren start that process. We need a spending diet that starts today, not 20 months from today when the President's statement of a freeze would actually start. His freeze won't start until October 1, 2011, and then it's a bit of a fig leaf at that.

Mr. Speaker, these are tough times. These are hard times. This isn't about being Republicans. This isn't about being Democrats. This is about a vision that we all ought to have for this country. That vision ought to include ways of fixing today's problems, however difficult those might be, with today's money. We have taken the process of using future generations' money to fix today's problem as far as it will go, and we simply cannot continue to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I would also ask that my colleagues consider a balanced budget amendment. If you were to ask me what is the most important constitutional amendment that we ought to be considering among that broad array of important constitutional amendments, it would be a balanced budget amendment that would force Congress to make those tough decisions; not a commission out there that could be some sort of a facade to try to get it done, but a true balanced budget amendment that every State government except one has to operate under.

Municipalities, counties, families, and businesses have to operate under the exact same discipline. We ought to be doing the same thing. Mr. Speaker, I would call for both of those things tonight.

## HONORING THE U.S. COAST GUARD CUTTER "MOHAWK"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor the brave work and the supreme dedication of the command and crew of the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter *Mohawk*.

The *Mohawk* has just returned from a 2-month deployment and is now home at Coast Guard Sector Key West. During their deployment, they were diverted to Haiti in response to the earthquake that hit on January 12. The *Mohawk* was the second cutter on the scene and the first to have Coast Guard crew members on the ground in Port-au-Prince.

On behalf of our grateful Nation, I thank each and every crew member for their role in this humanitarian mission. My most supreme appreciation goes out to Corpsman Second Class Elias Gomez. Corpsman Gomez will certainly be receiving commendations and awards in the coming months for his heroic actions in the gruesome scene that was Port-au-Prince.

Corpsmen Gomez set up a minihospital and triage directly in the streets of the capital. He set broken bones and he closed wounds, all the while having to create tools and making do with limited supplies. His actions were as resourceful, were as inventive and as innovative as they were lifesaving. Corpsman Gomez's "dirt medicine" was an example of American values at its finest. This great young American and father of four truly led by example, and I join with those whose lives he saved in thanking him for all that he has done.

Through efforts like those of Corpsman Gomez, the wonderful crew of the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter *Mohawk* helped save countless lives and performed their mission in accordance with the best traditions of the U.S. Coast Guard. Their assistance was both essential and invaluable.

We have all seen the devastation that is present at the island nation of Haiti, and it is beyond words. The United States has a unique duty to protect, to defend, and to support freedom, and all peoples, around the globe. As proven by the men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter *Mohawk*, this noble cause lives on in our Nation's oldest continuous seagoing service.

The efforts of the command and crew of the *Mohawk* have supplied a lifeline of humanitarian assistance to Haiti and will certainly help ignite the spirit of hope for recovery in that devastated island nation.

Every day, I give thanks to our local Coast Guard personnel, no matter how they serve. Their efforts are first and foremost to safeguard our Florida coastline. This fact is never lost on me or anyone else in south Florida. We feel their presence every day and take comfort in the fact that the men and

women of the Coast Guard Sector Miami, as well as the Sector Key West, truly lived their motto, "Always ready."

We as a nation can never repay those who serve, but we can take pride in knowing that those men and women have served not just our community but our neighbors in need as well. Their humanitarian mission reminds us all of what it means to be an American and why we should be so proud to say, every day, "I am an American."

The commitment of the U.S. Coast Guard is illustrative of how we must all do our part to help with continuing relief efforts in Haiti. To each and every crew member on the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter *Mohawk*, I say thank you: Commanding Officer Robert T. Hendrickson, Executive Officer John J. Driscoll, Corpsman Second Class Elias Gomez, and all of the crew as well as the families who support these heroes, thank you. Your works are testimony to our great Nation. "Always ready," and we thank you for it.

Thank you, U.S. Coast Guard. Thank you, Coast Guard Cutter *Mohawk*. Welcome home. Godspeed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFazio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## ATTORNEY GENERAL ERIC HOLDER MUST BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE IN WAR ON TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, our Nation received a very vivid reminder that Islamic terrorists are still at war with our Nation and are bent on killing innocent American citizens. On Christmas Day, an Islamic extremist attempted to blow up Northwest Flight 253 as it was on its final approach from Amsterdam into Detroit Metro Airport with a sophisticated bomb that was smuggled onto the plane in his underwear. This terrorist had been radicalized by al Qaeda on the Arabian Peninsula and trained in camps in Yemen.

Following his capture in Detroit, he was only questioned by FBI agents for a total of 50 minutes. Then, after that initial questioning, the bomber was sent to the University of Michigan Burn Center, which is probably the best medical care in the entire world, all at taxpayer expense. Then Attorney General Eric Holder had to decide how to proceed.

Did Attorney General Holder and the Justice Department immediately share the information that they had gathered, the intelligence, with senior in-

telligence officials? No. Did Attorney General Holder declare this terrorist an enemy combatant and turn him over to the military for further questioning? No. Did Attorney General Holder have the FBI continue the questioning in order to obtain more actionable intelligence? No.

So what did Attorney General Holder have the FBI do? He instructed them to give full Miranda rights to this terrorist, including the right to remain silent, and gave him not one, not two, but actually three taxpayer-funded attorneys. And guess what? After he lawyered up, he shut up.

The Attorney General did this even though this terrorist had fresh, firsthand knowledge of al Qaeda on the Arabian Peninsula, even though he had previously given actionable intelligence. And now we have made it very difficult to obtain any further intelligence, intelligence that could have led to the disruption of other planned terrorist attacks or assistance in unwinding this terrorist network.

And we need to ask the question, "Why?"

I believe that Attorney General Holder has built a culture within the Justice Department that seems to put the rights of terrorists ahead of the safety of our Nation. Let us remember that prior to becoming the Attorney General, Eric Holder and his law firm represented many, many terrorists pro bono; that is, for free. These terrorists were held in the military justice system, and they argued for their transfer to the civilian justice system, wanting to give them full constitutional rights. As well, he has placed other attorneys who have also represented terrorists held by our government into high-ranking positions within the Justice Department.

The Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, has not answered questions as to why senior intelligence officials were not consulted on how to proceed or why this terrorist was not treated as an enemy combatant. Mr. Speaker, it almost seems like Attorney General Holder has gone into the Witness Protection Program with regard to the Christmas Day bomber. If this Congress is to do its duty to provide appropriate oversight in the handling of these issues, Attorney General Holder must answer these questions.

Unfortunately, the lack of his consulting with intelligence officials or senior national security officials is nothing new. Attorney General Holder did not consult with senior military or intelligence officials before deciding to try Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and other 9/11 conspirators in New York City. He did not consult with the police commissioner or the mayor about security concerns before making that decision. And now New York officials have finally come forward and objected to this trial being held just a few blocks away from Ground Zero because of



their security concerns and, of course, the cost that is associated as well.

The administration is now looking for new locations to hold this trial as well as budgeting \$200 million for the first year alone to cover security costs. So this decision not only makes us less secure and gives a terrorist a platform from which to spew their hateful, anti-American rhetoric, it will cost the United States taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, all to extend a pre-9/11 mindset that views terrorism as a criminal offense instead of illegal acts of war.

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully offer some advice to President Obama and Attorney General Holder: Hand over the Christmas Day bomber to the military and intelligence officials and allow for an appropriate interrogation that will yield additional intelligence that will protect America, and keep Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and the other terrorists slated for civilian trials in New York City or wherever they end up at, keep them at Gitmo and try them before military commissions. Just over a year ago, they were prepared to plead guilty before military commissions, before Eric Holder made the decision to give them special rights. We could have executed one of them by now.

I sincerely hope that the President and his Attorney General rethink their current approach which, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is very dangerous for America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### AMERICA'S BEST DOING INCREDIBLE WORK IN AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. ING-LIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ING-LIS. Mr. Speaker, I'm just back from a trip led by our colleague, STEVE LYNCH, to Afghanistan and Pakistan, and what we saw there, Mr. Speaker, was America's best doing incredible work. The U.S. military is clearly the best trained, best equipped and most disciplined fighting force in the world.

I'm committed to keeping it that way and to supplying them with the resources they need to get their work done. I'm also committed to confining their mission to achievable objectives and to the protection of America's national security interest.

There are many memorable moments from this trip, Mr. Speaker. When we stepped off the plane in Pakistan, the first person I saw was Lieutenant Colonel Rick Simmons of Pickens, South

Carolina. Formerly the Veterans Affairs Officer of Pickens County, Colonel Simmons is now the Chief of Protocol in the Office of the Defense Representative to Pakistan.

Skipping a dinner with the delegation gave me the opportunity to have dinner with Colonel Simmons and seven other American service personnel at Simmons' apartment in Islamabad.

□ 2000

In Kabul, Afghanistan, I talked with Susan Anderson, who is serving in the American Embassy as an economic analyst. Susan is a graduate of Union High School and the College of Charleston.

In Kandahar, I met two members of the National Guard unit from Wellford, South Carolina, which deployed recently to Afghanistan. Justin McAbee of Travelers Rest and Zack Gregg of Pelzer. Justin's home is about 5 miles from mine. Passing by Benson Road as I travel on Highway 25 North will remind me to pray for Justin and those serving with him.

He is on the explosive ordnance detonation team. When I thanked him for serving our country and tried to compliment him on doing his very dangerous work, he gave me the standard response of our incredible all-volunteer force: "It's my job, sir."

At a dinner hosted by America's ambassador, Mr. Eikenberry, with female members of the Afghan parliament, we were called on to offer comments. I used my remarks to remember Geoff Whitsitt of Travelers Rest, who was killed last month by an improvised explosive device in Afghanistan. I wanted them to hear his name in Afghanistan, exactly one week to the hour after the Upstate paused for his funeral. I wanted them to know how precious his life was to his parents, to his brother, and to our mutual friends. I wanted them to understand that Geoff died for the protection of America.

I told them that we were willing to give our treasure in Afghanistan to help build their nation because we are sure that, using our creativity and entrepreneurship, we will make the money back. But, I told them we are willing to give the lives of our sons and daughters only for America.

On this point, Mr. Speaker, we must be clear. While we are hunting down terrorists, we are going to give the Afghan people the opportunity to reject al Qaeda outsiders and to build a future free of the Taliban. The Afghan people should seize the opportunity, as it will not last indefinitely.

At present, more of America's best are arriving in Afghanistan. They are there to kill terrorists. They are there to facilitate the work of an army of American civil servants and contractors who can show a way forward to a stable constitutional republic. They are there to serve America's national security interests by draining a terrorist cesspool.

But there will come a day when the brave men and women of America's Armed Forces will have completed their work. Not that they will have taken out every terrorist, for that would be impossible. But there will come a day when we will have destroyed enough of the terrorist networks in Afghanistan that America will be reasonably safe from murderous plottings, at least from within Afghanistan's borders.

Until then, we fight on, committed to finishing the job, clear-eyed and determined to avoid mission creep.

The trip also include crew rest stops in Romania and in Tunisia. In Tunisia, we visited the World War II North Africa American Cemetery and Memorial near Tunis, where 2,841 Americans are buried and 3,724 missing Americans are memorialized on a limestone wall called the Tablets of the Missing.

After a wreath-laying ceremony, the delegation walked among the graves. It was especially meaningful to walk among the graves with two of our young military escorts, Sergeant Rob Mennell and Sergeant Aaron Moss.

We tend to think of the members of the Greatest Generation as granddads, but they weren't granddads as they were serving in World War II. They were young, very young, as young as the two Army sergeants who were accompanying us on this trip.

I was grateful for the opportunity to tell those sergeants how much their service means to me and to all Americans, and I was grateful to remember why freedom is worth fighting for.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. REICHERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### FORT HOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I hail from Central Texas, and I am very, very proud to say that I have the largest military facility in the world in my district, Fort Hood, Texas. If you are in the Army, you know where Fort Hood is. In fact, I think if you find any 20-year veteran of the Army, you will find out they have been to Fort Hood, some of them once, twice, three, four times, because it is a huge training post. And it is the great place, as they call it, in Central Texas.

The great place had a great disaster happen to us on November 5 of last year, when Major Nidal Hasan attacked and killed 13 soldiers and a baby in the womb, and wounded 43 others before two courageous police officers, responding to this violence at Fort Hood,

came and basically shot the man and brought him down, one of them, a young lady, getting shot in the process. They got him captured. He is now the subject of much discussion around this House of Representatives.

And by the way, I don't know if anyone noticed. I was very surprised at the State of the Union to see those two officers sitting right up here with the First Lady of the United States, and I was very surprised also that they weren't introduced to the House. But if you noticed two police officers sitting by Michelle Obama, they weren't introduced at the State of the Union, but those were the two officers who responded to Major Hasan when he went on his shooting rampage. We honored them, and the President and the First Lady were honoring them as heroes of the United States, and rightfully so.

But I want us to first realize what happened at Fort Hood. And everybody says, Oh, come on. I know what happened. Sure, you listened to all the reports. But today I was talking with the mayor of Belton, which is actually the county seat of Bell County.

Fort Hood sits in two counties, Bell and Coryell County. Fort Hood is hundreds of thousands of acres and it straddles the county line between those two great counties. The combined population of the two counties is over 300,000 people. So this is a growing area of Texas, and much of that growth that is in the western part of Bell County and the eastern part of Coryell County is military folks that have retired and come back to live close to Fort Hood, or they are presently serving in the military in some form or fashion, or they got out and went to work for something that is related to the military in Central Texas.

We are a military community. We love our soldiers. I would argue that no place on Earth does more for the families and soldiers than Fort Hood, Texas.

I love to tell the story of being in a Rotary Club meeting back in 2003 or 2004, I don't remember what it was, but I know that the 4th Infantry Division was deployed overseas from Fort Hood at that time. And it was along about March, somewhere around that time, when I was going to give a talk to that Rotary Club. It is a huge club, meets in the morning. Hundreds of people were there. And one of the Rotarians got up and said, Ladies and gentlemen, I want to remind you, our soldiers are deployed. Baseball season is starting. Our coaches for our Little League, Pony, Colt, and other leagues where our kids play baseball are over fighting a war to protect our freedom, and we need coaches. So it is up to us Rotarians to stand in for those fathers and mothers who are not going to be able to coach their kids.

Now, that is a community that thinks outside the box to make sure that the kids and families of these deployed soldiers can live as normal a life as they can while these soldiers are de-

ployed. I wanted to tell you that story, Members, because it tells you the heart of the Fort Hood community in an easy story.

But when I was visiting with the mayor of Belton today, you don't realize the ramifications of something like what this Major Hasan did.

First, we very quickly realized after the shooting and the days and weeks that came after the shooting that you had a lot of soldiers saying to themselves: Wait, a minute. This guy wasn't in some other Army. This guy was in my Army. He was in the same uniform I wear, and he shot my brother and sister soldiers and killed them and he was targeting soldiers to kill. Now, that plays upon the psyche of soldiers.

Now, let me explain to you how important this is at Fort Hood, Texas, because the Fourth Infantry Division deploys out of there, III Corps Command is at Fort Hood, and the 1st Cavalry Division, as well as various other organizations. All of these folks have been deployed multiple times. The people that are stationed at Fort Hood are war fighters, and they have been involved in this war since its inception, and they will continue to do their duty, which is a great strain upon their families and a great strain upon these individual soldiers. But they do it because it is the right thing to do and they know that.

These are our great generation. These are heroes, real true heroes. And do you know what? Just doing any job that is that stressful that many times repetitively wears upon you even if you weren't getting shot at or blown up. So this is a highly stressed, highly strung-out community.

When this happened at Fort Hood, first responders from all the surrounding communities headed to Fort Hood. SWAT teams headed for Fort Hood. And if you recall, if you were listening during the play-by-play as it was being developed, you heard people say there are some who say there were three shooters, and so they are looking for the other two. What I didn't realize until I was talking to the mayor of Belton—and Belton is like 26 miles from Fort Hood—he said that, because they didn't know if the other shooters had gotten out of the post and were loose in the community, they locked down all the schools where there were soldiers' children just in case this was a plan to spread out and kill family members.

And so we had, from high school down to elementary school, children locked down in the schools, and we were keeping people out and their parents couldn't pick them up. And the first responders' communications systems were overwhelmed with concerned parents from two full counties, 300,000 people.

So what this man did at Fort Hood that day frightened all the kids in two counties. And there are tens of thousands of kids going to those schools in those counties, multiple high schools.

These are our largest high schools in Texas. They were locked down.

I tell you all this because I want you to know that this was truly, not just a traumatic event for the Army, this was a traumatic event for the people who support the Army and for the families who are supported by the people who support the Army.

Now, the mental health professionals came in in droves, and a lot of great work was done, and I praise everyone who did that. But when I heard that story about these little kids locked down, let's take some little sixth-grade kid or fifth-grade kid, or maybe someone smaller, a first-grade kid who had the trauma of all of a sudden the doors were locked to his school and his mama couldn't pick him up or her mama couldn't pick her up. And then they started hearing why: There has been somebody shot over at Fort Hood.

Now, all these kids have soldiers at Fort Hood who are their parents. Some of them have two parents who are soldiers at Fort Hood. Now, there has got to be fear in the hearts of these little kids, and they want to know what happened. And when school is out and people are talking about it and they are watching it on television, they are trying to figure out what happened. And I am sure parents tried to sit down and explain it where they calmed the little children down. But I am going to argue with you or state to you here tonight that a recent report that was put out by a commission that was appointed by the Obama administration to tell us about the incident at Fort Hood, I would say if you read that report or you explained that report to little kids who were locked down at Fort Hood, you wouldn't even know that Mr. Major Nidal Hasan gave every indication that he was a radical Islamic Muslim terrorist, because it is not discussed in the report, and it should be.

□ 2015

I don't know who pulled the strings on this, but I know who is responsible, and that is the administration. We learned all kinds of things the Army needs to do differently and all kinds of things they need to talk about, the chain of command, yada, yada, yada, as my college-age girl would say. But we didn't hear anything about radical Islam. We didn't hear anything about this because, I would argue, and I think there are people across this country that are arguing, that it was because of political correctness. Political correctness.

Excuse me, at some point in time it is just good intelligence, good police work to look at what makes up the chances are of the next terrorist attack. And to ignore it, and to act like you can't talk about it because you might hurt somebody's feelings—I tried sitting here tonight to remember as far back as I could, and I don't know how many years ago it was that the Munich Olympics was, but that was a radical Muslim terrorist attack. And every attack since that time has been a radical

Muslim terrorist attack. So why can't we talk about the fact that our enemy seems to be, good intelligence seems to tell us, is radical Islamic terrorists?

Now, why in the world can you write a report about a guy who walked down a peaceable line, some of the people checking in from being at war, and some of the people checking out to go to war, doing their everyday duty of getting through that process of processing in, processing out, and this guy walks down the line shooting soldiers in uniform, shouting out, "Allahu Akbar," God is great, which is a part of the declaration of that religion. And I am not attacking that religion. But you can't talk about it. If you can't talk about it, you can't figure it out.

And to write a report with this many Americans killed where they should have been safe, and this many Americans wounded where they should have been safe, and not mention the profile of the guy that did the shooting, and to give me the excuse when I asked the question, well, we are afraid it will mess up their murder case. Well, let me tell you, I will state this again for the record, if you have got a law degree and you are supposed to be able to practice law and you can't prove a murder case where you got 200 eyewitnesses, you need to send your law degree back to law school and turn in your bar card because you are an ineffective lawyer. And there are at least 200 people that witnessed this guy shooting these folks.

So I mean give me a break. They don't have any proof problems to prove this case. That is not a reason not to talk about who did the shooting or who is alleged to do it. And I am an old judge, use the term alleged. It is perfectly good. But they don't even talk about who is alleged to have done the shooting or what kind of person that was.

What do we know about him now? I will have to give our news organizations a lot of credit. We know that he acted erratically for months before the attack. That he promoted radical Islamic views while at Walter Reed Hospital. That he exchanged emails with Anwar al-Awlaki, a Yemen cleric which we are reading about every day in the newspaper who is one of the now major promoters of terrorism. No action was taken against him when he would have debates with other members of the military, and his position was what our soldiers were doing in Iraq and Afghanistan was worse than what terrorist attacks do or the 9/11 attack. That the 9/11 attack doesn't equal America's war fighting efforts. And nobody reported him? In fact, they promoted him to get him out of their hair, to move him to another duty station so they didn't have to put up with him.

And it was all about Islamic terrorism, and yet our government writes a report and just fails to mention it. And what is really amazing, really amazing to me, I mean there are a lot of people pointing a finger at me and

saying that guy is a right wing wacko. That is why he is standing up there. I won't shy away from the right wing part of it. I will shy away from the wacko part.

But I will tell you, who else has raised this question? Kind of interesting. Time Magazine has raised the question in an article, "Fort Hood Report: Why No Mention of Islam?" Now, that is certainly not a famous right wing radical group. I would call them leaning over pretty hard to the left. Here is another one. You sure wouldn't consider people at the San Francisco Chronicle to be right wing wackos, but here it is: "Political Correctness on Fort Hood at the Pentagon." And it is about why didn't they talk about who this guy was.

So that is one of the things I got up for. And I see I am joined by one of my dear friends, who is always there for me, PHIL GINGREY from Georgia. He and I are classmates. He always has something good to say.

Doc, I yield whatever time you would like to use.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Judge CARTER, I thank you. I am glad to be with you tonight talking about a very, very serious issue. I will make the light comment before I begin and say that my good friend from Texas is not a right wing wacko, he is just a regular wacko. I am a right wing wacko from Georgia. But Judge CARTER is actually not right wing nor is he a wacko, Mr. Speaker.

What he is talking about tonight is extremely important. And I hope our colleagues on both sides of the aisle are listening. I know that my former colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee listened very carefully ever since this incident occurred. And now of course the judge is talking about this 50-page report that our Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates, ordered, commissioned to be done by a former Army Secretary and former Chief of Naval Operations.

And Judge CARTER, Mr. Speaker, I think expresses the view of probably most members of the House Armed Services Committee. I can't put words in their mouth, but I have served with them 6 years, loved being on that committee, led by the great chairman IKE SKELTON and our ranking member BUCK McKEON from California. And it is a great committee. And it is a bipartisan committee. It is probably the most bipartisan committee in the entire House of Representatives. I bet that is true on the Senate side as well.

But Judge CARTER is disappointed in this report, Mr. Speaker, and I am disappointed in this report. When we heard about this tragedy at Fort Hood in the great State of Texas at this Army military installation, which really is probably the epitome of the Army military installations—when you think about the Army you think about Fort Benning, the home of the infantry in my great State of Georgia down in Columbus, and you think about Fort

Hood, probably the first two that come to your mind.

But we were briefed. We, all members of the House of Representatives, all 435 of us, had an opportunity to go to a briefing that the military, the people from Fort Hood, commanders, I forget their names, probably good I don't remember the names because I don't want to use them here tonight, but they were telling us, "Well, look, we responded correctly." Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what was said. "The response to this incident, you would be proud. Members of Congress, you would be proud. Everything, we got all the emergency teams in, we locked down." The judge is talking about locking down the schools and all that and making sure the kids were safe.

And they went on for about 30 minutes, describing how the response to this tragic attack, where this guy kills 14 and wounds 43 before we were able to take him down, and I want to say of course that we salute the heroism that was shown that day at Fort Hood, and I don't know who they were, but Judge CARTER probably does, and God bless them for what they did. But my concern at the time was how do we have ourselves in a situation where anybody that goes nuts—of course we know this situation was far more than just an incident of somebody going nuts. And that is the purpose of the hour tonight the judge is talking about. But we should have been able to take this guy out you would think after he had shot three or four people at the most. But that is kind of another story, Mr. Speaker.

I was just so concerned when I heard that briefing shortly after the incident that it was like the military was telling us, you know, you should be proud of the fact that we responded after the fact. And that is my whole point, Judge, in sharing a little bit of this time with you. It was like locking the barn door after the horse is long gone. And that is what we did. We did a good job of that.

But what the judge is talking about here tonight, Mr. Speaker, is that when you have clear evidence that someone is a radical, has become radicalized, and you have this information and you don't share it—and indeed, as was pointed out tonight, Major Hasan was promoted during this time just right up through the ranks. You know, no holes on his promotion, no concern, because of, yes, I will say it, political correctness. They did not want to be in a position where let's say somebody could lose their job because they were calling out someone, blowing the whistle and saying this guy is showing signs of Islamic extremism. And we need to connect these dots, and somebody needs to examine this person and let a psychiatrist see him, the psychiatrist, Dr. Hasan. Doctor, you can't treat yourself, you need some help.

Well, and I think that what the judge is saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we have got to stop this political correctness

nonsense. We did the same thing I think, in my humble opinion, on Christmas Day with the undie bomber, when a decision was made after 50 minutes by one or two FBI agents talking with someone in the Justice Department, and that someone most likely was the Attorney General, Eric Holder, and saying, all right, this is not a terrorist, let's Mirandize this guy. And so he immediately gets lawyered up, as the expression goes, and shuts up on the advice of counsel.

I was reading today, looking over the budget, the \$3.8 trillion budget proposal which the President delivered to Congress on Monday. And in that budget the line item section in regard to what we have always called, and I think the world has known the global war on terrorism and the amount of money that we want to fund for that, we call it overseas contingency operations or some such nonsense like that. Nowhere in that budget, no matter how many hundreds of billions of dollars we need to fight that war, do we call it a war on terror. Oh, God no. God forbid we do that because it is politically incorrect. We don't want to offend anybody. I say call a spade a spade.

And that is exactly, Mr. Speaker, what Judge CARTER is trying to point out to our colleagues tonight. Make sure people understand if we are serious about protecting this country, the security of this country, we are going to stop all this nonsense and we are going to call a spade a spade and we are going to fight terrorism where we find it.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, we are going to call a terrorist a terrorist and say who he is, what he is, where he comes from, what his background is, and if religion has a part in it, what religion has a part in it.

□ 2030

We cannot afford—it's bad police work, if nothing else—to ignore that evidence. What do you tell that kid over at the high school when his dad is deployed and he asks his mom, he said, Wasn't this guy a soldier? Well, I can't say what kind of soldier he was because we've got to be politically correct. But, yes, he was a soldier. But how do I know my dad is safe with other soldiers? How do I know?

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Judge, would you yield just for a second? Judge CARTER, I don't know whether you pointed this out before I got to the floor, but this guy, Major Hasan, was quoted as saying that sharia law should trump the United States Constitution. Am I correct on that?

Mr. CARTER. That is correct.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I yield back.

Mr. CARTER. And this guy was radicalized. And now we're hearing—only from the news sources, not from the people in the administration that should be informing the public about this, but from news sources—we're hearing just how radicalized he was by

conversations he's had. In fact, a Member of this House called a relative who went to medical school in the Army and happened to know the guy in medical school and said clear back in medical school he was talking about this stuff. That means we gave him—by the way, we paid for his medical education. And the good doctor from Georgia can tell you that's no small ticket right there. But we took this man and we put him through education and we educated him all the way through university, medical school, and all of his specialty stuff. The Army paid for that. You did. The taxpayers paid for that. And even then he was talking like this. Why can't we start being honest with ourselves and talk about these people? That's the issue.

You mentioned the Christmas Day bomber. Our good friend, Dr. BURGESS—maybe he doesn't want me to tell you this—but he said, There's a guy that ought to be the easiest guy in the world to interrogate because this guy has just set himself on fire in his crotch area. Now his choice is to go back to Yemen and get treated over there, or be treated by the best medical community on Earth, as was pointed out. It wouldn't be hard to say, Tell us what you know and we'll get you the best doctors, the best reconstruction surgeons in America. And we are the best. And the guy would gratefully share, it would seem to me, but not after you've lawyered him up after an hour.

So, once again, though, I would argue we're playing the political correctness game. We wouldn't do the same thing for a regular criminal defendant, I'll tell you that. I'll tell you that. So it's different. And I worry about the fact. And that comment about overseas contingency. If they can't identify the war on terror as the war on terror, then we've got some black-and-white-striped cats that they're welcome to come down to Texas and pet those cats, because their really skunks. If you don't want to call them a skunk, call them a pussycat and start playing with them. See what happens to you. That's the same thing that happens to terrorists. If you're not going to call them a terrorist and point out what ideology is driving their thinking, then what are you going to do to identify your enemy and defeat your enemy? If you're not even going to call them an enemy, what are we doing?

I yield back.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Thank you, Judge. I want to thank JOHN CARTER, Mr. Speaker, for introducing two pieces of legislation. I hope he'll discuss that with our Members tonight in regard to the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act. H.R. 4267 is the number of that bill, Mr. Speaker. And then the other one, equally important, the Fort Hood Families Benefits Protection Act, H.R. 4088. I know Judge CARTER, Representative CARTER, will talk about that as a great Member who is actually cochairman of the House Army Caucus.

So this is a labor of love on the part of this Member, Mr. Speaker. I can understand how upset he must be, as we all are, regarding this 50-page report. Here, again, distinguished cochairs—the former Army Secretary, the former Chief of Naval Operations—who were charged by our Secretary of Defense, Secretary Gates, in a very timely manner to produce a 50-page report. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, this report, again, there's not a word in there in regard to terrorism, Islamic extremism. I don't know whether they scrubbed it before they did the report or they scrubbed it after they did the report.

It's so disappointing to see that you spend all that time saying, Well, maybe we need to streamline the way the sergeant talks to the lieutenant and the lieutenant talks to the captain and the captain talks to the major and the majors talk to the colonels and lieutenant colonels and then finally we get the information to the generals and to the admirals. That's all well and good, but it's almost like a deliberate attempt to miss the point.

The point is, as Judge CARTER has pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing with an individual, in the case of Major Hasan, that is a terrorist. He has been radicalized. The judge has pointed out that there was information even from his time in the Army Medical School that he made radical statements. I mentioned just a second ago that he was quoted as saying that sharia law should trump our Constitution. Well, when you're commissioned as an officer in the military, when you enlist in the military, you make a pledge of fidelity to this country. And so the warning sign was there.

I will go back to the time, Mr. Speaker, when Representative CARTER, Judge CARTER, and I were freshmen Members of the 108th Congress. The 9/11 issue had occurred shortly before we got here. And the families of those victims, over 3,000, insisted that we form a commission, a 9/11 Commission, and we really look into this. Quite honestly, President Bush at the time was a little reluctant. He felt like the Department of Homeland Security, the CIA, and the military intelligence could do all that.

In any regard, a commission was formed. And we were told by the commissioners that this was a problem in regard to Islamic extremism and we needed to do something about it. And to then come along with this report that was commissioned by Secretary Gates, I think, is a tremendous disservice and disappointment. And I will yield back to Judge CARTER.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend for yielding. I thank my friend for mentioning these two bills that we've got out here. I tried a whistleblower case back about the mid-nineties sometime. A very interesting case. I won't go into the details. But it involved some organizations that were major political players and major financial players in Texas and a little small accountant who made a right statement but had

stepped on some good-old-boy toes and so they fired the guy when the truth was he was telling that there was a lot of money that they were losing. It showed me why we have whistleblower laws: so the little guy who discovers a wrong can be comfortable in going to right that wrong without fear of retaliation, of getting fired because he did—told about something that the big boys didn't like.

Well, we've got this Military Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act. It protects military personnel from any negative action for reporting any regulation or law violation. Proposed protections for reporting ideologically based threat or actions a servicemember reasonably believes could be counterproductive or detrimental to the United States interests or security.

Basically, what we're saying to the ordinary soldier, to the soldier that was going through medical school with Mr. Hasan, to the soldier that was stationed with Mr. Hasan when he was a second lieutenant and then a first lieutenant and then a captain and as he got promoted to major, that somebody didn't have a fear that something would happen to their military career if they reported this guy was talking radical ideas to service people. He wasn't preaching religion to them. He was talking that blowing people up was good, fighting conventional war against terrorists was bad.

I mean, that's the kind of way he was talking. It didn't have anything to do with the Muslim religion. It had to do with terrorism being the right way to straighten out America. Excuse me? He was educated by the United States military. It kills me to hear that.

So I think it's a good bill. I hope we can get some action on it. I hope we can get it written into law. And I'm going to be working on it. I feel confident. I have a lot of folks that are co-signers to that bill.

This other one is pretty simple, too, really. What we had—and I can say this almost without—and I don't know the names and background of every one of these soldiers, but I have personally talked to several of them and the general consensus is everybody that got shot had either just come back from Iraq or getting ready to deploy again to either Iraq or Afghanistan.

And the reason we had mixed units that day at that center is because normally units go through as a group as they deploy, but these were the guys that were absent for some purpose. May have still been on the training range or something else. So they had to go make up by getting all the paperwork shuffled to get ready to deploy. That's why you heard it wasn't just one outfit that had all the deaths. It was multiple outfits around the Army because there are multiple outfits stationed at Fort Hood.

Anyway, I would argue these were warriors either returning from the war or going to the war and an enemy soldier, terrorist, disguised in a uniform

of the United States military, walked into our warriors as they were peacefully getting ready and processing paper and started killing soldiers. And I do argue that's a combat situation. Whether you're killing a soldier in Afghanistan or Iraq or whether you're killing a soldier in a center at Fort Hood, if your intent is to kill soldiers to keep them out of the war against terror, you are an enemy combatant killing our soldiers. Therefore, they should be treated with combat respect.

This incident should be like we did for what happened at the Pentagon when it was attacked on 9/11. We declared that to be an incident in combat in the war on terror and the people who did heroic acts there received the appropriate medals and the appropriate benefits for being injured or killed in a combat zone.

I think Fort Hood and the incident that happened with Major Hasan should be a combat zone; and I'm trying to do it by statute. But it's been done by act of the Defense Department. I think it's time for it to be done. There are a lot of Purple Hearts that ought to be awarded, at least 43 that we know of. There are a lot of folks that should get civilian medals that were civilians that were accidentally wounded in the misfires. And there are benefits that attach to being killed or injured in combat. I think these people ought to get it. Just because they just got back from another country but they got shot in our country by an enemy soldier, I would argue they still ought to be treated as if they were wounded in combat.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, and, Mr. Speaker, I thank Judge CARTER for yielding. I don't think that the logic of this legislation is a stretch in any way. I'm sitting hear listening, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague from Texas describe this bill, Fort Hood Families Benefits Protection Act, H.R. 4088.

I would think that you ought to get 434 votes, if not 435, in the House of Representatives, and 100 in the Senate. Judge, is my opinion, because that Islamic extremist—and, as you say, camouflaged in an Army uniform with officer's insignia on that uniform—is every bit of an Islamic extremist as those characters in Afghanistan, in Iraq, aided and abetted, I think, by Iran, in many instances, that make those improvised explosive devices, that put them in the ground, that detonate them cowardly in a remote fashion and blow our young men and women to smithereens. I've had over 30 from my congressional district in the 11th of Georgia pay the last full measure. And that's what these 14 that were killed and 43 or whatever the number is in Fort Hood. Same thing. Exact same thing.

□ 2045

And so, Mr. Speaker, I commend them. I think it's absolutely right. They should have a status to ensure

full benefits and eligibility for the Purple Heart and a civilian equivalent award for those who are civilians. They were killed not by just some ordinary nut. They were killed by an Islamic extremist in the same fashion that our men and women are being killed in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Mr. CARTER. That's exactly right. And reclaiming my time, once again—and I'm not going to mention who said this, but it was said at the time. And although I understand why it was said, I think it was inappropriate. A statement was made, I certainly hope this incident at Fort Hood doesn't affect the Army's diversity program.

Excuse me. We had folks that had risked their lives for our country killed in their own backyard by an Islamic terrorist, and I think that it's not the time to be worrying about whether somebody's feelings may have gotten hurt because we're talking about this guy being an Islamic terrorist. He is. That's a fact. Why can't we talk about it?

I understand people talking about profiling, and what they're talking about is, in its ultimate extent, what offends people is situations in our historic past where, for example, there has been a shooting on the square. It's been identified. It was an African American. Round up all African Americans because the profile is African American. And that's where the whole idea of profiling—and you can expand it to American Indian, to Hispanic, to Vietnamese—identifying a whole group as evil because one was bad. And that's bad. And the police will tell you that that is not good police work.

But if the shooter is wearing a major's uniform, answers to the name of Hasan, and 200 people can identify him in a lineup for having done the shooting, then you ought to talk about what the guy looks like, where he comes from, what his background is, and what motivated him to do this, which is a radical religious belief, the bottom line. That's not being politically incorrect. That's being intelligent. I'm sorry. It's just common sense.

There's one thing I tell people back in Texas—I'm sure my friend in Georgia gets frustrated with it, too, sometimes. Inside this Beltway, the thing we lack the most seems to be common sense most of the time. Average American people know this, and I think that the Members of this House know that the folks back home know that this is something the administration should have addressed. Secretary Gates ordered it, but he's part of and takes his orders from the Commander in Chief, and they should be held responsible for their yielding the truth to political correctness. It's not the right thing to do. It harms those people who fearfully today, as I am talking, are standing in harm's way on our behalf, on my behalf, on your behalf, on everybody's behalf. They're doing the hard job.

There is a movie that's out that really is realistic. I'm going to quote it because I'm not trying to promote movies. But it makes you feel the stress that soldiers have to deal with when they have these explosive devices and having to deal with those explosive devices. It was so tense, my wife covered her head with a pillow because she just couldn't stand the tension of it. And then you think about it and say, You know, we eat in the mess hall at Fort Hood with these guys. They go through that every day, the stress. She covered her head with a pillow. These kids—kids—they deal with it every day. So they're not kids anymore when they go over there. They're men and women of courage and honor, and they understand what it means to be courageous.

So I think it's wrong for us to avoid describing our enemy to keep from stepping on somebody's toes. I have nothing against any—and when I say all this, let me preface this or finish this up by saying this is not about a religion. It's about a criminal defendant and his ID. And that's the way we should treat it. For that reason, I have raised this issue.

I will yield some more time to my friend from Georgia if he wishes to speak.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for yielding.

I just wanted to quote some of my friends on the Armed Services Committee, the ranking member—actually also on the Education and Labor Committee—Colonel JOHN KLINE. Colonel KLINE is a subcommittee Chair, I believe, on Armed Services as well. He has been there since we were elected in the 108th, back in 2003. So this is his eighth year on the Armed Services Committee. It is very appropriate that Colonel JOHN KLINE is there because of his service in the United States Marines.

But Judge CARTER, here is what Colonel KLINE said. Mr. Speaker, I want to quote this. "The American people recognize that the 9/11 Commission was correct when it said we have an enemy, and it's Islamist extremists—their words—and the concern is that we may not be paying attention to the fact that the alleged perpetrator was, in fact, an Islamic extremist."

Judge CARTER is telling us, Mr. Speaker—and certainly I agree with him—that this is not about diversity, the importance of diversity in the military. We all understand that. We all understand that. We have great men and women of all kinds of ethnic backgrounds, religious backgrounds. They have one thing in common: They swear, as we do, as Members of Congress, to uphold the Constitution and defend this country. And that will be continued to be held in common. But this business of being politically correct for fear of offending but not being able to say, He did it, and here is the evidence, and everybody knows it, and for fear that you are going to get rep-

rimanded—and that's what Judge CARTER's other bill is all about, Mr. Speaker. So I thank him for giving me the opportunity to join a good friend on the floor to encourage our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

There are 95 cosponsors. I hope tomorrow there will be 150, and the next day there will be 300, and that when this comes to a vote—and hopefully it will—we'll get a near—maybe we can put it on the suspension calendar and it will pass without controversy.

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend for that comment, because what a heartwarming experience that would be for the families and some of the soldiers who were there and who are now in the combat zone to know that this Congress said, We recognize this was a combat situation. We acknowledge it unanimously. It is hard to get unanimous around here, but it would be nice. And I thank my friend for his participation.

Well, this is all a part of the chance that I get every now and then to talk about the rule of law and doing what's right and identifying what's wrong in this country and not being afraid to speak out and to point out when things are wrong. I want to end by saying that this is a wrong that needs to be righted, and this House and the Defense Department has the ability to right this wrong, and we should do it.

I want you to know that I consider Secretary Gates a friend. I have the highest respect for him. I had the highest respect for him when he was the top man at Texas A&M University when I represented that wonderful institution, and I still have the highest regard for him. But I do criticize and will continue to criticize letting political correctness interfere with making correct statements about what happened so that, if nothing else, the kids of these people in the Army who know that a major shot other people will have a good explanation as to why he did it and what the indications are as to why he did it so they're not worried about their mom or dad getting shot by another guy in uniform. That's a tragic situation.

I want to thank the Speaker for allowing me to have this time. I hope that we can right this wrong, and I hope that we can let common sense and right over wrong prevail in these two bills and in letting our heroes know what the right thing to do is and that we're going to do it.

#### TELEWISE HEALTH CARE NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the Speaker for the recognition.

Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are at the end of another workday on Capitol

Hill. It's a snowy night outside in the Nation's Capitol, and we are having a conversation, you and I, here on the House floor. I will do most of the talking, but I know that my remarks must be addressed to the Chair, and they certainly are addressed to the Chair. But, Mr. Speaker, both you and I know that people can listen in on our conversation because the cameras of C-SPAN are here in the Chamber. And although they don't record the faces and presence of everyone else on both sides of the aisle who are here in the Chamber, they do record what we say here and they do record the conversation that goes on between us. And people across the country, whether it be late at night, as it is here on the east coast, or very early in the evening, as it is in the Mountain States or on the west coast, the people across the country have an opportunity to tune in and see what is happening on the floor of the people's House in their Nation's Capital.

It almost seems like it's always been that way, but it hasn't. March 19, 1979—if I've done my research correctly—was the first broadcast of the proceedings from the floor of the House. So not quite 30 years ago. In fact, we'll have the 30-year anniversary here in just a few weeks—I suspect that will be a big celebration—of the C-SPAN cameras coming to cover the activities of the House. Yes, the other body as well. They cover the high-level meetings that go on here on Capitol Hill and, of course, meetings that are of importance in State legislatures across the country.

It is the public service access channel for all things government, and people of my generation, people who came of age during the Nixon administration and the Watergate years and the excesses of some of those activities, people of my generation equate C-SPAN with good governance. C-SPAN is sort of like the rainbow after the rainstorm which is the promise that we will never have to go through that again because C-SPAN is there, and C-SPAN will keep the lights on and C-SPAN will keep the sunshine in on the legislative process. And if what we are doing here in the people's House is not to the people's liking, they shall be aware of it, and they shall be able to register their displeasure and change some of our faces if they can't change our hearts, such as the ideal in the American democracy.

So C-SPAN is important. C-SPAN is equivalent with good governance. C-SPAN is equivalent with open governance. And that's why many of us, toward the end of the year, all of the things that were happening in the end of December and the beginning of January, were somewhat taken aback by the fact that Brian Lamb, the chief executive officer of C-SPAN, wrote a letter to the White House and said, Hey, let's bring the cameras in to all of these health care negotiations that are going on in the Capitol and the White



House and points in between. We'll provide the camera. You provide the discussion, and the American people can tune in, if they like, and see if they like what they see or not.

Of course, Mr. Lamb's invitation was declined by both the White House and the Democratic leadership in both the House and the Senate, and the cameras stayed off and the deals were done in the dark. And as a consequence, arguably, that's one of the reasons why the health care bill still languishes out there somewhere. No one really is sure what its health or state is today. I submit to you that despite the effects of the election in Massachusetts 2 weeks ago, one of the main drivers of the lack of success was the lack of transparency during that debate and during that process.

It has been a year full of twists and turns as we watched how health care policy has risen and fallen and risen again and then fallen again through the course of many twists and turns this past year, but C-SPAN should have been there. In fact, we were promised that C-SPAN would be there. We weren't promised it once or twice or three times. We were promised over and over again. And we weren't promised that C-SPAN would be there by myself, Mr. Speaker, or yourself, Mr. Speaker. We were promised that C-SPAN would be in the room by the person who was then the candidate for the highest elected office in the land, who ultimately won that office and was inaugurated just a little over a year ago.

□ 2100

Barack Obama repeatedly said that he would invite the C-SPAN cameras into the room. We'll have everyone around a big table; everyone will get to see who's on whose side, and who's on the side of the special interests, and who's on the side of the people because C-SPAN will be there and C-SPAN will report dispassionately, and people will be able to make up their own minds; the ultimate we report, you decide scenario.

But it didn't happen that way. And as a consequence, whether you liked the health care legislation or didn't like the health care legislation, as a consequence, right now its fate is very, very much in limbo. What I wanted to do tonight was just sort of take us through some of the history that has gone on over this past year. I want to talk specifically about something that happened in my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, last week on Wednesday when we heard a resolution of inquiry in the committee, and what the result of that hearing was and what people can actually look to next. But interwoven through this entire process is the fact that the whole reason we're having this discussion is because the lights were turned off, the cameras were silenced, and the American people could not participate, if they so chose, in at least the observation of the debate, in the observation

of the deal-making, if you will, that occurred in both the House and the Senate and the White House as this bill worked its way through the process.

So it's no wonder that people were skeptical of this bill last summer. We heard about that in the summer town halls. It's no wonder that people were skeptical of this bill as it came through the House in November and then the Senate on Christmas Eve. And then it's no wonder that people continued to be skeptical as it worked its way ultimately to the nondecision that it has achieved today.

So here we have the quote from Brian Lamb on December 30, 2009, the CEO of C-SPAN, Brian Lamb sent a letter to the Congressional leadership requesting that they "open all important negotiations, including any conference committee meetings, to electronic media coverage because the legislation will affect the lives of every single American." I would just add to that every single American for the next three generations at least, so far-reaching was the scope of the legislation to be considered.

You know, several years ago, long before I was in any way active in politics, the first President Bush, the 41st President of the United States, made a very famous statement that perhaps he came to regret afterwards, which was "Read my lips—no new taxes." That one quote was replayed over and over and over again, and it may have at least participated in the event that cost the 41st president a second term in office. And we had the situation this past 2 years, while the current President was running where he repeatedly made statements about his commitment to transparency, about a new way of governing and, oh, by the way, we'll throw the doors and the window open, invite the C-SPAN cameras in, and you'll all be able to see what has transpired.

Going back on that word, I submit, will be every bit as significant as the "read my lips" quote has become. Well, let's go through a few of these, because, again, they are important. While the theme, thematically they're all very similar, there are differences. The first one, this is January 2008 at the Democratic debate: "Not negotiating behind closed doors, but bringing all parties together and broadcasting those negotiations on C-SPAN so the American people can see what the choices are, because part of what we have to do is enlist the American people in this process."

January 2008 the Democratic Debate. The second quotation on this board: "These negotiations will be on C-SPAN. The public will be a part of the conversation and will see the choices that are being made."

January 2008, to an editorial board at the San Francisco Chronicle. Important concepts that the then-presidential candidate and now President discussed at those venues, important concepts that he emphasized multiple

times during the runup to the Presidential election. The third quote in our series: "I respect what the Clintons tried to do in 1993 in moving health reform forward. But they made one really big mistake, and that is, they took all their people and all their experts into a room and then they closed the door. We will work on this process publicly. It will be on C-SPAN. It will be streaming over the Net."

November 14, 2008, in a Google question-and-answer. This was after the actual presidential election had been won by Mr. Obama that this quote was made. You know, I stop for an observation here for a moment. I was a physician in practice in 1993 and 1994 when the Clintons very famously took everyone, the 500 folks, behind closed doors and made all these deals. It was kind of a little bit of levity around the doctors' lounge that one day a doctor would be elected President of the United States and bring 500 other doctors into a room and lock them all together and help figure out a way that we could figure out how much to pay lawyers in the future. Okay. That's my attempt at humor for the night, Mr. Speaker.

Number 4: "We'll have these negotiations televised on C-SPAN so the people can see who is making arguments on behalf of their constituents and who is making arguments on behalf of the drug companies or the insurance companies." August 8, 2008, Virginia town hall. This is probably one, of all of the series of quotes, this is one of the most important, because, again, the presidential candidate was saying, Look, these negotiations are going to be going on. You're going to have people around the table, Members of Congress, Senators, and yes, the special interests will be there. In this case, the drug companies were mentioned. In this case the insurance companies were mentioned. There are other special interest groups of course, unions that negotiate through competitive bidding, negotiate insurance contracts, they might have an interest. An organization like the American Association of Retired Persons that sells insurance, they might have an interest around the table. But nevertheless, the special interests will be there because, after all, this is Washington, D.C., and the very least that the people should ask is that the cameras be turned on and the event be filmed so that they can watch it as it occurs, or they can refer back to it after the fact.

Many of these videos, of course, would have been captured in perpetuity up on YouTube or some other site, so the American people would have had an ability to look in there and gauge for themselves, hey, is my Senator really arguing more on behalf of the people of his or her State, or are they arguing more on behalf of the drug company or the insurance company, medical device company or the labor union? We didn't get that chance. It was promised to us but not delivered.

Number 5: "But here's the thing. We're going to do all these negotiations on C-SPAN so that the American people will be able to watch these negotiations." March 1, 2008, State of Ohio, town hall.

Number 6: "We will have a public process for forming this plan. It will be televised on C-SPAN. I can't guarantee you that it will be exciting, so that not everyone will be watching, but it will be transparent and it will be accountable to the American people." November 27, 2007, Keene Sentinel.

Number 7: "I want the negotiations to take place on C-SPAN." May 2008, Saint Petersburg Times. Number 8, "I'll put forward my plan. But what I'll say is, 'look, if you've got better ideas, I'm happy to listen to them.' But all this will have to be done on C-SPAN in front of the public." April 25, 2008, Indiana town hall.

What a great idea, Mr. President. I simply could not agree with you more. Well, Mr. Speaker, as it turns out, in May of last year, May the 11th, the White House engaged in a major stakeholder meeting at the beginning of this health reform debate. The attendees at the White House in May were the Advanced Medical Technology Association, the American Medical Association, America's Health Insurance Plans, the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, the American Hospital Association, the Service Employees International Union.

Now, each of these individuals was there because, number one, they provide a service to the American people and they have a very strong interest in the process going forward of what was going to happen with health care reform. So I don't fault any of these groups for responding to the call of the White House. Hey, will you come down here and talk to us as we get this process started because we don't want to leave anyone not included in this process? So I think the fact that these six groups showed up down at the White House, I think that's fine. That's what the process was supposed to be about.

Now, when these participants emerged from the meeting, an agreement was announced that they would work to decrease by 1½ percentage points the annual health care spending growth rate, saving upwards of \$2 trillion over 10 years time. Since then, however, questions, questions that I have submitted, questions that others have submitted to the White House as to how this would be accomplished have simply been left unanswered. Now, whatever happened down at the White House last May, call them gentlemen's agreements, backroom negotiations, power politics, we know that they happened. What none of us in this Chamber and none of us in the other body know is what was agreed to.

Along the way I started to read and hear reports in the press about amendments being rejected in committee hearings and markups because of pre-

viously agreed-to deals. Now, in the other body, in the Senate Finance Committee's markup, Senator NELSON of Florida introduced an amendment regarding drug prices. The Senator from Delaware, Senator CARPER, arguing against that amendment said, whether you like PHARMA or not, we have a deal. We have a deal. Well, what deal? Who has a deal? Where was the deal made, and who was it made with?

Secondly, in the same markup, the Finance Committee endorsed a commission to slow Medicare spending. Now, I may not agree with the principle involved in that, but nevertheless, let's have this debate out in the open and let it win or lose on its merits. But in that same markup in the Senate Finance Committee they endorsed a commission to slow Medicare spending. However, the bill had to be rescored and rewritten, had to go back to the Congressional Budget Office to be rescored to exclude hospitals because, according to Congress Daily, "They already negotiated a cost cutting agreement" with the White House. They had a deal. They had a deal. What deal? Who made that deal? Under whose authority was that deal made?

Number three, Senators DORGAN and MCCAIN introduced a floor amendment on prescription drug reimportation in December. According to The Hill, the newspaper that's circulated up here in the Capitol, according to The Hill, "A deal between the White House and the pharmaceutical industry held up and helped defeat the amendment." What deal? With who? On whose authority was this deal made?

Now, for all my affection for Senator MCCAIN, I disagree with him about reimportation. But at the same time, let's have that debate. Let's have that debate and let the people hear what the pros and cons are, but let's not carve up a deal behind closed doors. Even though my position arguably won in that exchange, that doesn't make me feel any better that some sort of deal was cut behind closed doors that then would not allow reimportation to be included or considered in the process.

□ 2115

You know, Mr. Speaker, here's the frustration: as a Member of Congress, the press seems to know more about these deals and this process than any of us in this body or the other body. The press knows more about this stuff than we do.

Now, while the Democratic majority was pushing a health reform bill through both Chambers of Congress and Members were expected to debate these far-reaching bills, real deals were being cut down at the White House; the real deals were being cut down in the Speaker's Office or over in the Majority leader's office with ample input by the White House, I might add, but all behind closed doors and very few people in the room besides a few select Members of the House and the Senate, of course the people from the White

House, and of course respective staff members from those offices.

But none of us who were elected by the good and long-suffering people of the United States of America to represent their interests, none of us were included in that process on either side. Now, I am saying this as a Republican. We're in the minority, okay. We lost the last election. Maybe we don't deserve a place at the table. What about Democrats? Shouldn't Democrats who are freshman, Democrats who've been here four terms, five terms, six terms, shouldn't they have at least had the opportunity to at least know what was going on in those deals? To the best any of us know, no one from either side, outside of a few select persons in Democratic leadership in the House and the Senate and, of course, the White House, was involved in those negotiations. They clearly circumvented the legislative process.

Now, the six groups that I referenced early in this discussion, while they were meeting at the White House, our very own Committee on Energy and Commerce was marking up what at the time was called H.R. 3200, which was the original health care bill that went through all three committees of jurisdiction of the House, a 1,000-page bill—eventually got a lot longer—but that's another story. But while we were marking this up, this stuff was going on down at the White House. And, again, none of us knew any of these things. Now, how could our markup be viewed with any integrity if the real deals were being cut at the White House?

And I'll tell you something else—and this is particularly, particularly troubling—we worked on that bill in good faith in committee. I submitted I can't tell you how many amendments. I prepared 50. A lot of my amendments were shot down along party lines. Okay. I get that. That's what the deal about partisan makeup is. That's why elections are important; and, Mr. Speaker, I hope people pay attention to that fact. But I did get some amendments accepted, and some of those passed on a voice vote where there was no objection from the other side. One in particular was a bill that took part of the old concept of the patient bill of rights from the late 1990s that if we're going to have a public option insurance company, patients should at least have the opportunity for internal and external review, that is, a review board from inside the insurance company or one outside the insurance company if they don't like the insurance that was rendered.

So internal and external review was a very important part of what was called the patient bill of rights legislation. Charlie Norwood from Georgia was the principle author of that concept along with JOHN DINGELL, who's the chairman emeritus on our committee. So clearly a bipartisan concept from within our committee.

I submitted an amendment that essentially embodied that internal/external review. It was accepted by the committee unanimously, and Mr. DINGELL and I both spoke on it in committee; and it seemed like, well, if nothing else, Charlie Norwood's legacy will be enclosed in this bill in the form of this amendment.

But we passed that bill out of committee July 31. We went home for our summer recess. We had the summer town halls, which are another story in and of themselves. Many people may remember some of the excitement around the country when the health care town halls were going on this summer.

Then we come back in September and most of October, and then we get a new copy of the bill. It's now 2,000 pages. You say, Well, it's 2,000 pages because you added a lot of amendments in committee. Yeah. But guess what? Those amendments were gone. They were struck from the bill. No discussion. No one called me up and said, Hey, look, we're sorry, but your amendment that you offered in committee kind of conflicts with some other language in the bill. We've got to take it out. No discussion as to what occurred, and that amendment was removed from the bill.

It wasn't just me. It wasn't just a personal vendetta against a relatively junior Member from Texas. Mr. WALDEN, who was going to be on the floor with me tonight, the ranking member of the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce, had amendments that he had gotten into the bill, and those were struck at the same time.

And you have to ask yourself, well, why would you strike an amendment on internal and external review? What's the purpose? Who gains there? Was there one of those six groups that were down at the White House that didn't like the language of the bill so they had to get it out of there? Was there someone in the Speaker's Office or on the Speaker's staff who had a problem with the fact that that language was in there? Was it perhaps a lingering bit of friction between the former chairman of the committee and the Speaker? No one knows. No one knows. All we're left with is to fantasize about what might have caused that relatively innocuous amendment to be stricken from the bill.

And, again, it wasn't just my amendment. Other amendments were stricken from the bill, too, and was it because they crossed some line with some of the deals that were struck with this group of six individuals down at the White House?

Now, after months of frustration with working on the bill through committee and getting amendments in and having them struck, I sent a letter to the White House in September, and I requested full disclosure on what had happened to those meetings in May and June specifically to the following areas: number one, a list of all agree-

ments entered into in writing or in principle between any and all individuals associated with the White House and any and all individuals, groups, associations, companies, or entities who are stakeholders in health care reform, as well as the nature, sum, and substance of the agreements;

Number two, the name of any and all individuals associated with the White House who participated in the decision-making process during these negotiations and the names and dates and titles of meetings that they participated in regarding negotiations with the aforementioned entities in question one.

So we wanted to know who was there, and we wanted to know who negotiated and what the parameters of those negotiations were, who in the White House had the clout and the authority to make these decisions. And then, number three, the names of any and all individuals, groups, associations, companies, or entities who requested a meeting with the White House regarding health care reform who were denied a meeting.

So who were the stakeholders who were locked out of these meetings? We had six different groups around the table. Were there others who wished to be there but were not permitted? A question we just simply don't know how to answer today.

I noted in my letter that during the Democratic Presidential primary debate on January 31, 2008, then-candidate Obama said, That's what I will do in bringing all parties together, not negotiating behind closed doors, but bringing all parties together and broadcasting those negotiations on C-SPAN so that the American people can see what the choices are, because part of what we have to do is enlist the American people in this process.

You know what? I agree with the President on that part. Part of what we have to do is enlist the American people in this process. And can there be any doubt, can there be any doubt after watching the anxiety in this country in August during the summer town halls, after watching the gubernatorial returns in November from New Jersey and Virginia and then 2 weeks ago the senatorial returns from Massachusetts, can there be any doubt that they failed to enlist the American people in this process? And as a consequence—as a consequence—the American people have said and keep saying, No, we don't want this health care bill, we don't trust a 1,000-page bill; we really don't trust 2,000-page bills and 2,700-page bills are simply out of the question. You guys never read it. You wouldn't take this insurance yourself. No way are we going to accept this.

And underneath it all, underlying it all, is the fact the American people were shut out of the room during the process after they had been promised a front row aisle seat to the proceedings on C-SPAN.

Now, I sent that letter to the White House in September. Answering my let-

ter would have been the chance for the White House to prove to America that this actually was a good campaign promise and they really were for transparency down at the White House. But I didn't get an answer.

December 16, this House was rapidly trying to wrap up its business. The Weather Channel was forecasting a huge snowstorm for that weekend. Everyone in the House of Representatives wanted to get out of here and to their district. They didn't want to be stuck here in the Nation's Capital for a single day more than necessary, and we were rapidly wrapping up our work. And on December 16 I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 983 for people who want to look it up at home, because it became clear to me that the White House had no intention of responding to my letter.

So I introduced a bill, which was a resolution of inquiry. Now, this is a kind of an uncommon parliamentary tool. It's very powerful, puts some power in the hands of the minority. We don't have many tools at our disposal, and we don't have many tools that are very powerful at our disposal; but, realistically, it was my only option. I had no place else to go because I had been rebuffed by the White House. I have been rebuffed in committee. I had been rebuffed at the Speaker's Office. I had nowhere else to go.

So to me it was very important that the details of any negotiations made behind closed doors be made public for all to see: the integrity of the process, literally the integrity of the whole health care reform effort, the whole health care reform legislation, the integrity of the whole health care reform legislation is in fact at stake.

Now, President Obama promised to run the most transparent and open administration in history, and his decision to sequester, his decision to hoard, his decision to hide and obscure this information from Congress and from the American people is, in fact, indefensible.

Now, on January 26, just last week, I got a letter from the White House. Months of silence. One hundred and nineteen days from the date I sent the letter, right before the scheduled markup of the resolution of inquiry, I did receive a response from the White House.

The response was 81 pages long. There was a two-page letter from White House counsel Robert Bauer. There were 24 pages printed off the White House Web site. Anybody can go get them and print them off. There is a thank-you letter from the President to the six groups for showing up on May 11. There were some blog posts. There were some speech transcripts. There were some press releases, 18 pages of already-published White House visitor logs, 36 pages of print-offs from Web sites of the six groups.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to finally get a response from the White House; but, you know, it

wasn't what we were asking for in the resolution of inquiry, and it's not the information needed to really understand the scope of the agreements that were entered into.

Now think about it for a minute. You have these six very powerful groups—AdvaMed, Pharma, AMA, American Hospital Association, the Service Employee International Union, all meeting down at the White House coming up with proposals to shave \$2 trillion off health care expenses over the next 10 years, \$2 trillion and no one wrote anything down. Mr. Speaker, do you believe that? That strains credulity, doesn't it? \$2 trillion in deals and just a handshake? Just a wink and a nod? Nothing written down? Nothing on paper?

Mr. Speaker, would you make a deal like that? More importantly, Mr. Speaker, would you ask the American people to accept a deal like that?

Well, last week on January 27, the Energy and Commerce Committee began a markup of the resolution of inquiry. The markup was called not by me but by the chairman of the committee because the committee had to consider this resolution, and if the committee failed to consider the resolution, it automatically becomes a privileged resolution: we come directly to floor of the House.

□ 2130

Now, in fact, HENRY WAXMAN, Chairman WAXMAN, the chairman of my committee, a Democrat on the other side of most issues, agreed to help. He agreed to help me. He agreed to help Ranking Member BARTON get answers, not to everything I submitted, but to six out of the ten things that I had requested. It certainly showed a step in the right direction. In fact, it was the first positive step toward getting any sort of sunlight onto these deals that were cut down at the White House.

So the committee will soon send a letter to the White House signed by Chairman WAXMAN and Ranking Member BARTON of the full committee asking for more information. What that information will comprise, number one, a list of all agreements entered into in writing as well as the details, including the sum and substance, of all deals and agreements; number two, the names of any individuals, groups, associations, or companies that attended meetings at the White House regarding health care; the name of the administration officials who attended the meetings on health care in the White House. As part of the release of visitor logs, we know who brings people into the White House. We just now want to know who met with the person who was being allowed in. The time and date of such health care meetings, and who, from the administration and from the outside groups was in attendance; written materials memorializing any agreements made during the meetings with administration officials and provided to outside participants; finally,

number six, any paper or electronic communication, including emails in the possession of the Secretary of Health and Human Services or the staff of Health and Human Services, between HHS and the health industry in regard to health reform negotiations or the White House deals.

That's what I will get. I asked for more than I actually will receive. What I will not get are written notes made by a stenographer or other note-taker of meetings with White House officials and/or outside groups memorializing discussions or agreements; number two, I will not get written material summarizing negotiations or agreements made with administration officials and outside groups and possessed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services or other officials within the Department of Health and Human Services; I will not get written material memorializing discussions between the President, his senior advisers and those in attendance written for the President and not provided to outside groups; and number four, I will not get internal emails within Health and Human Services and all agencies regarding the possible implementation of policies discussed at White House meetings in regard to health reform.

So those are some significant omissions. But the six things will be requested of the White House by the chairman, and for that we are very grateful. Of course, the White House will assert, if any of these other four had been included in that list, the White House would assert executive privilege and it likely would lead to a court fight, and likely the White House's assertion of executive privilege would be upheld.

But I will say one thing. It has certainly shown me some of the items that, in fact, I should be allowed to see occur because they are communications at the level of the Federal agency. Internal communications of the White House and internal communications between the President's advisers are not, are not going to be made available because that's White House executive privilege.

We've had the interposition of multiple czars this past year. Well, every Presidential administration has had czars. We've certainly seen a great number of those positions now come into being, and because of the position of the White House czar, those emails between the health care czar and the President's Chief of Staff, for example, the health care czar and anyone else in the President's inner circle, those emails are protected under executive privilege, so having the czar in the White House is another way of helping to keep that information from public view.

Information that comes from the Secretary of Health and Human Services through the Federal agency, that information is information that I was allowed to request. But information from the health care czar to the White

House Chief of Staff is information that I will not receive. And that is a shame because I really believe that within those communications, within those communications is really where these deals would occur.

But at least with the six things that are going to be allowed, at least with getting that information out into the open, certainly provides some additional places for, if the press is at all curious about this—they may not be, they have been relatively incurious about many of these aspects through the course of this last year. But if there is any curiosity on the part of the fourth estate, this will perhaps give them some direction to go into where they might inquire further to get additional information. It's an honest attempt to understand the deals that were made.

I'm a member of the American Medical Association. I pay my dues every year. I have to admit I was somewhat surprised when the AMA agreed to endorse the bill when it included none, none, zero, none of their top priorities. It didn't include anything about tort reform in the bill. It didn't include anything about SGR or physician payment reform. It didn't include anything about the ability of physicians to get together and negotiate price. None of that was included in the bills that we saw, and yet the AMA endorsed H.R. 3200 before it ever got to our committee for a markup.

What was in it for them? Why would they do this when their top issues were not included in the bill? That is something as an AMA member, not as a Member of Congress necessarily, but as an AMA member, I would like to know.

Last Monday, the President said: I didn't make a bunch of deals. Now, this claim contradicts everything that has been reported. If he didn't, somebody did. Who did? And again, on whose behalf and under what authority? There is nothing inherently wrong with the President engaging in such an important topic or encouraging groups to act in the best interest of the public. There is nothing wrong with the groups acting in their own self-interest or the self-interest of the members of their industry. But we don't know if the deals struck were in the best interest of the public. We don't know if the deals that were sealed were the best deals for the American people.

The American people certainly don't know because they were completely shut out of the process. Now, these questions will linger over my Committee of Energy and Commerce and the Senate Finance Committee. Indeed, this very House will have the specter of those questions lingering until we fill in its history. And it's really as simple as that. So my resolution of inquiry last week was simply to fill in a few of those pages in the historical record which otherwise are going to be lost to the sands of time.

Let me reiterate, this is not about the groups included in the resolution. I

know there are plenty of people on both sides who like to beat up on any number of people who are part of the six groups. There are people who like to beat up on unions. There are people who like to beat up on drug companies. This isn't about—this isn't about any of the people who responded to the President's call and went down to the White House that day to work for, arguably, what would be a good thing in reforming some aspects of our Nation's health care system.

The problem is that the American people didn't get to see what it was they had on the table, what the offers were, what the counteroffers were, what wasn't offered, and who agreed to what, who was on the side of the people and who was on the side of the special interests. As the President said, we didn't get to see that.

As it stands now, I asked, I want to know what the White House negotiated, with whom, and on what terms. I want to know how those deals influenced the legislative process. Certainly, there were several times where we bumped up against it. Certainly, the Senate Finance Committee did, and they were told, Hold on, you can't do that. We've got a deal. But did it also influence the legislative process when my amendments and GREG WALDEN's amendments were stripped out of the committee-passed bill and were stripped out of the Speaker's office never to see the light of day? So was that part of the legislative process influenced by those deals? We will never know if we don't get that information.

And I want to know why a President who committed himself to transparency feels really no need to heed requests for transparency by the committee; why the President who ran on transparency feels no need to heed a request for documents by an elected Member of Congress, why they think it is okay to just simply not respond to a letter, ignore it, and we hope it goes away.

Now, last week, the President, on one of the interviews, said that his lack of transparency was "a mistake." If true, if he feels it is a mistake, he can correct the mistake. It's not too late. He can correct the mistake by turning over the information requested, and, in fact, turning over all of the information, saying, Do you know what? We are not going to hide behind executive privilege here. If there is an e-mail between my Chief of Staff and the health care czar that you think is important, we're willing to let you see that as well. We're willing to let the American people see that, because we have nothing to hide.

If they don't do that, what are we left to surmise? That they've got something to hide. And what would they have to hide? I don't know. Here the fantasy can become worse than the reality. It would be better for the White House to provide this information. Again, the truth, the truth will, in all likelihood, be much less significant

than what each of us will be left to imagine on our own if we are not provided that information.

Now, to fully understand the policy choices going forward, we need to know what took place at the White House last year. I can't say it enough. I can't say it in enough different ways. The American people expect us to act in their interest rather than protect the business interests of those currying favor in Washington. We hear that all the time. In fact, we hear this President say that lobbyists won't have any access to his administration, and then we have secret deals with six groups that play a big role, a big role, in the cost of delivering health care in this country, and we don't get to see that.

If any member of those six groups down at the White House sought protections or made unreciprocated concessions to Washington politicians, I think the American people deserve to know. The American people would likely want to know that information. These negotiations may have produced consensus on policy changes that are proper and needed, but we will never be certain until the facts are known. And if the facts aren't known, then the reality is not known. And if the reality is not known, then the fantasy becomes the reality, the worst excess that you could imagine is probably what happened; otherwise, they would open the books and tell us.

Now, I will just leave you with the same thought one last time about the promises made during the Presidential campaign and after about how this process would be an open process, how this process would be an inclusive process, and inclusive not just to Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, which it has not been, but an inclusive process that would include the American people; because, after all, these decisions on health care, yeah, they're tough, yeah, there are going to be likely some winners and losers in whatever is finally crafted by the House and Senate, but it's going to affect the delivery of health care. It's going to affect the life of every doctor, nurse, hospital administrator, every mother, father, child, every husband, wife, every citizen of the United States, not just next year, not just the year after that, and not just the year after that, but for the next three generations; how health care is delivered in the country, who gets what, who pays for it, when it's administered, who can't get what they need. All of that is going to be governed by language in this legislation.

And if there were outside influences on crafting that language in this legislation, we need to know about that because, otherwise, we don't know the questions to ask. We don't know whether to embrace or reject the legislation, because we simply don't know who, what, and where was involved in the process. And as a consequence, it makes it impossible, literally impossible, to evaluate the worth of this legislation.

So here we sit, on Groundhog Day, sort of revisiting what happened over the last year with health care reform. On February 2 of 2010, the passage of a comprehensive health care bill looks as unlikely as at any time in our history past of this Congress. A year ago, it looked like a certainty. Today, it looks extremely problematic.

□ 2145

And what is the one thing that could have given us a better bill, given us a better process, given people some reason to be behind this legislation that Congress is considering?

The one thing that could have happened that didn't was opening the process up, turning on the C-SPAN cameras, inviting them in to that big conference table in the Speaker's office or that big conference table in the majority leader's office over in the Senate, or that big conference table down in the Cabinet room at the White House. Turn those cameras on, let the American people see who was around that table, who was willing to talk, who was willing to give, who was only willing to get. That would bring powerful information to provide to the American people.

The President could have recruited, could have recruited from the American people, folks who like this legislation who would then ask for it. But, instead, they pushed everyone away, pushed them away from the table, turned off the camera, turned off the lights. "Don't look at the man behind the curtain. We know what is best for you. This bill will be good for you. Trust us. You will like this bill once we get it passed." Well, that is nonsense. The American people know that is nonsense.

Turn on the lights, turn on C-SPAN, let the people in, and let's give this bill the full public airing that it has deserved.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. ELLISON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. TIAHRT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of being unavoidably detained in Kansas.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. EHLERS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a family member's medical emergency.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, February 3, 4, and 9.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, February 3, 4, and 9.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, February 3, 4, and 9.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and February 3 and 4.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REICHERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia, for 5 minutes, February 3.

### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on January 29, 2010 she presented to the President of the

United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 4508. To provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 3, 2010, at 10 a.m.

### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official travel during the first, second, third, and fourth quarters of 2009 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Stephen Elmore .....	11/6	11/15	Kenya .....	.....	1,344.00	.....	9,367.10	.....	.....	.....	10,711.10
Jeffrey Holland (CBO Detailee) .....	11/6	11/17	Kenya .....	.....	1,344.00	.....	8,073.10	.....	.....	.....	9,417.10
Hon. Cynthia M. Lummis .....	11/24	11/27	Kuwait .....	.....	159.00	.....	7,138.60	.....	.....	.....	7,297.60
Committee total .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,847.00	.....	24,578.80	.....	.....	.....	27,425.80

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr., Chairman, Jan. 26, 2010.

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Daniel McGlinchey .....	10/2	10/7	Turkey .....	.....	2,960.45	.....	8,244.60	.....	.....	.....	.....
Sabahat Qamar .....	10/2	10/7	Turkey .....	.....	2,960.45	.....	8,244.60	.....	.....	.....	.....
Joseph Pinder .....	10/2	10/7	Turkey .....	.....	2,960.00	.....	8,244.50	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hon. Christopher John Lee .....	10/30	10/31	United Arab Emirates .....	.....	484.30	.....	8,149.10	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hon. Christopher John Lee .....	10/31	11/1	Afghanistan .....	.....	15.00	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hon. Christopher John Lee .....	11/1	11/2	UAE .....	.....	193.00	.....		.....	.....	.....	.....
Hon. Erik Paulsen .....	12/12	12/14	Kuwait .....	.....	448.00	.....	7,138.60	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hon. Erik Paulsen .....	12/13	12/14	Iraq .....	.....		.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hon. Randy Neugebauer .....	12/4	12/5	Kuwait .....	.....	466.00	.....	7,138.60	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hon. Randy Neugebauer .....	12/5	12/7	Afghanistan .....	.....	78.00	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hon. Tom Price .....	11/25	11/26	UAE .....	.....	505.00	.....	9,463.50	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hon. Tom Price .....	11/26	11/27	Afghanistan .....	.....	28.00	.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hon. Tom Price .....	11/27	11/29	Pakistan .....	.....	76.00	.....	438.60	.....	.....	.....	.....
Committee total .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. BARNEY FRANK, Chairman, Jan. 20, 2010.

#### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Bradley W. Smith .....	11/9	11/14	Macedonia .....	.....	1,000.00	.....	9,059.20	.....	480.00	.....	10,539.20
	11/14	11/15	Vienna .....	.....	424.00	.....	.....	.....	188.00	.....	612.00
Bradley W. Smith .....	11/21	11/30	Kenya .....	.....	2,503.01	.....	8,033.10	.....	1,125.45	.....	11,661.56
Committee total .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,927.01	.....	17,092.30	.....	1,793.45	.....	22,812.76

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER, Jan. 19, 2010.



## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

## HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ZOE LOFGREN, Chairman, Jan. 16, 2010.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

## HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALI BRODSKY.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Harlon Watson .....	5/31	6/13	Germany .....		4,294.00		7,584.35				11,878.35
Harlon Watson .....	3/27	4/9	Germany .....		2,160.00		7,584.64				9,744.64
Committee total .....					6,454.00		15,168.99				21,622.99

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALI BRODSKY.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Barton Forsyth .....	8/2	8/9	China .....		1,534.97		11,931.87				13,466.84
Harlon Watson .....	8/8	8/22	Germany .....		3,377.58		7,605.50				10,983.08
Committee total .....					4,912.55		19,537.37				24,449.92

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ALI BRODSKY.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Harlon Watson .....	10/31	11/8	Spain .....		3,845.00		8,690.20				12,535.00
Joel Beauvais .....	11/1	11/8	Spain .....		3,605.00		5,937.20				9,542.00
Harlon Watson .....	9/25	10/11	Thailand .....		1,876.00		8,623.30				10,499.00
Michael Goo .....	9/25	10/11	Thailand .....		1,876.00		4,388.10				6,264.00
Hon. Edward J. Markey .....	10/23	10/25	Denmark .....		1,026.00		8,961.00				9,987.80
Gerard Waldron .....	10/23	10/25	Denmark .....		1,026.00		8,961.00				9,987.80
Gerard Waldron .....	12/16	12/20	Denmark .....		892.00		(?)				892.00
Hon. Edward J. Markey .....	12/16	12/20	Denmark .....		892.00		(?)				892.00
Jeff Duncan .....	12/16	12/20	Denmark .....		892.00		(?)				892.00
Ana Unruh Cohen .....	12/14	12/20	Denmark .....		1,115.00		8,325.00				9,440.00
Harlon Watson .....	12/6	12/20	Denmark .....		3,122.00		6,720.00				9,842.00
Joel Beauvais .....	12/10	12/20	Denmark .....		2,230.00		8,983.20				11,213.20
Michael Goo .....	12/8	12/19	Denmark .....		2,453.00		7,456.00				9,909.00
Barton Forsyth .....	12/13	12/22	Denmark .....		2,007.00		8,983.20				10,990.20
Thomas Schreiber .....	12/13	12/19	Denmark .....		1,338.00		8,018.20				9,356.10
Elan Burnham-Snyder .....	12/16	12/20	Denmark .....		892.00		10,003.10				10,895.10
Committee total .....					29,087.00		104,051.00				133,138.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

ALI BRODSKY.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings .....	11/11	11/14	Switzerland .....		1,986.18		8,198.40				10,184.58
Alex Johnson .....	11/10	11/15	Switzerland .....		3,310.00		6,109.60				9,419.60
Committee total .....					5,296.18		14,308.00				19,604.18

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS, Chairman, Jan. 27, 2010.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

## HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL, Jan 21, 2010.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5872. A letter from the Director, Program Development and Regulatory Analysis, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Electric Program: Definition of Rural Area (RIN: 0572-AC15) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5873. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Veterinary Accreditation Program [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0093] (RIN: 0579-AC04) received December 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5874. A letter from the NRCS Acting Farm Bill Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Compliance With NEPA (RIN: 0578-AA55) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5875. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Revenue Assistance Payments Program (RIN: 0560-AH90) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5876. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Paracoccus Pigment [Docket No.: FDA-2007-C-0456] (formerly Docket No.: 2007-C-0245) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5877. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Funding and Fiscal Affairs; Risk-Based Capital Requirements (RIN: 3052-AC51) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5878. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2011, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1105(a); (H. Doc. No. 111—82); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5879. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Prepaid Assessments (RIN: 3064-AD51) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5880. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Prompt Corrective Action; Amended Definition of Post-Merger Net Worth (RIN: 3133-AD43) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5881. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization and Operations of Federal Credit Unions; Underserved Areas (IRPS 08-2) (RIN: 3133-AD48) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5882. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund Premium and One Percent Deposit (RIN: 3133-AD63) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5883. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — USERRA Benefits Under Title IV of ERISA (RIN: 1212-AB19) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5884. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Benefits and Assets; Expected Retirement Age received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5885. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Limitations on Guaranteed Benefits; Maximum Guaranteeable Benefit

received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5886. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5887. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Current Good Manufacturing Practice for Positron Emission Tomography Drugs [Docket No.: FDA-2004-N-0449] (formerly Docket No.: 2004N-0439) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5888. A letter from the General Counsel, FERC, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revised Filing Requirements for Centralized Service Companies Under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 2005, the Federal Power Act, and the Natural Gas Act [Docket No.: RM09-21-000; Order No. 731] received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5889. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-292, "Advisory Neighborhood Commission Vacancy Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5890. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-296, "Hospital and Medical Services Corporation Regulatory Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5891. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-295, "High Technology Commercial Real Estate Database and Service Providers Tax Abatement Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5892. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting

Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-302, "Anacostia River Clean Up and Protection Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5893. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-301, "Unauthorized Contract Stop Payment Temporary Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5894. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-299, "Abe Pollin City Title Championship and Title Trophy Designation Temporary Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5895. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-298, "Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect Temporary Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5896. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-297, "Agreements Between the District of Columbia and Boys and Girls Club of Greater Washington Temporary Approval Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5897. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-291, "Affordable Housing Opportunities Residential Rental Project Property Tax Exemption and Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5898. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-290, "Park Place at Petworth, Highland Park, and Highland Park Phase II Economic Development Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5899. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-289, "51st State Commission Establishment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5900. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-288, "State Board of Education License Plate Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5901. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-287, "WMATA Compact Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5902. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-300, "Executive Grant-Making Authority Limitation Temporary Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5903. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-286, "Heights on Georgia Avenue Tax Exemption Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5904. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-293, "District of Columbia Housing Authority Board of Commissioners Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5905. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 18-294, "Arthur Capper/Carrollsville Public Improvements Rev-

enue Bonds Amendment Act of 2010"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5906. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2010 Harvest Specifications and Management Measures for Petrale Sole [Docket No.: 0907301200-91412-03] (RIN: 0648-AY07) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5907. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for 2009 Winter II Period [Docket No.: 0809251266-81485-02] (RIN: 0648-XS93) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5908. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 090206144 9697 02] (RIN: 0648-XS73) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5909. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator For Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions in the Longline and Purse Seine Fisheries in the Eastern Pacific Ocean in 2009, 2010, and 2011 [Docket No.: 0907231161-91189-01] (RIN: 0648-AY08) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5910. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries Regulations; Fisheries in the Western Pacific; Pelagic Fisheries; Hawaii-based Shallow-set Longline Fishery [Docket No.: 080225267-91393-03] (RIN: 0648-AW49) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5911. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-groupers Fishery of the South Atlantic; Closure of the 2009-2010 Commercial Fishery for Black Sea Bass in the South Atlantic [Docket No.: 040205043-4043-01] (RIN: 0648-SX56) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5912. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North and South Atlantic Swordfish Quotas [080724902-91404-02] (RIN: 0648-AX07) received January 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5913. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Clemente Island Northwest Harbor December and January Training; Northwest

Harbor, San Clemente Island, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0921] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5914. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by de Havilland, Inc.) Model DHC-8-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0785; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-125-AD; Amendment 39-16163; AD 2010-01-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5915. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Corporation Model DC-10-10, DC-10-10F, DC-10-15, DC-10-30, DC-10-30F (KC-10A and KDC-10), DC-10-40, DC-10-40F, MD-10-10F, and MD-10-30F Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2007-0186; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-226-AD; Amendment 39-16156; AD 2009-26-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5916. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Riverton, WY [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0704; Airspace Docket No. 09-ANM-9] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5917. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment and Modification of Class E Airspace; Bishop, CA [Docket No. FAA-2009-0695; Airspace Docket No. 09-AWP-7] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5918. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Gadsden, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0955; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-28] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5919. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; St. Louis, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0543; Airspace Docket No. 09-ACE-9] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5920. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; West Branch, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0696; Airspace Docket No. 09-AGL-18] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5921. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Albany, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0631; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-19] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5922. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Red Oak, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0801; Airspace Docket No. 09-ACE-11] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5923. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Qualification and Certifications of Locomotive Engineers; Miscellaneous Revisions [Docket No.: FRA-2008-0091, Notice No. 4] (RIN: 2130-AB95) received January 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5924. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Altus, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0540; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASW-17] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5925. A letter from the Senior Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Passenger Equipment Safety Standards; Front End Strength of Cab Cars and Multiple-Unit Locomotives [Docket No.: FRA-2006-25268, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AB80) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5926. A letter from the Lead Aerospace Engineer (Structures), Office of Aviation Safety, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Notification and Reporting of Aircraft Accidents or Incidents and Overdue Aircraft, and Preservation of Aircraft Wreckage, Mail, Cargo, and Records received December 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5927. A letter from the Branch Chief, Border Security Regulations, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Importer Security Filing and Additional Carrier Requirements; Correction [Docket Number: USCBP-2007-0077] (RIN: 1651-AA70) received December 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5928. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Extension of Temporary Rules Allowing Governmental Issuers to Purchase and Hold Their Own Tax-Exempt Bonds [Notice 2010-7] received December 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5929. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Arbitrage Treatment of Certain Guarantee Funds [Notice 2010-5] received December 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5930. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 2009 Cumulative List of Changes in Plan Qualification Requirements [Notice 2009-98] received December 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5931. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Extension of Deadline to Adopt Certain Retirement Plan Amendments [Notice 2009-97] received December 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5932. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application of Section 382 to Corporations Whose Instruments are Acquired and Disposed of by the Treasury Department Under Certain Programs Pursuant to the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 [Notice 2010-2] received December 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5933. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance on the Application of Sec. 409(a) to Changes to Nonqualified Deferred Compensation Plans to Comply with an Advisory Opinion of the Office of the Special Master for TARP Executive Compensation [Notice 2009-92] received December 18, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ARCURI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1051. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4061) to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-410). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. SCHAUER, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 4553. A bill to amend the Buy American Act with respect to certain waivers under that Act, to provide greater transparency regarding exceptions to domestic sourcing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HODES, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 4554. A bill to reauthorize the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal years 2011 through 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. JONES, Mr. SHULER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MASSA, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HODES, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. BOYD, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. GRJALVA):

H.R. 4555. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care to veterans who were stationed at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, while the water was contaminated at Camp Lejeune, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BOREN, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 4556. A bill to prohibit the use of Department of Justice funds for the prosecution in Article III courts of the United States of individuals involved in the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 4557. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that schools have physical education programs that meet minimum requirements for physical education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 4558. A bill to designate as wilderness certain lands and inland waters within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KISSELL (for himself, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. MASSA, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCMAHON, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine):

H.R. 4559. A bill to establish a commission to review benefits provided by each State to disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KRATOVIL:

H.R. 4560. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to increase transparency and accountability for earmarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 4561. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a limited exclusion from gross income for the discharge of indebtedness of individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 4562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a temporary deduction for interest on unsecured credit card debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 4563. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage of screening for breast, prostate, and colorectal cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. STARK, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms.

CHU, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 4564. A bill to extend for 1 year the Emergency Contingency Fund for State Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. ARCURI, and Mr. MINNICK):

H.R. 4565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a refundable credit for increasing employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 4566. A bill to terminate authority under the Troubled Asset Relief Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COOPER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 4567. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide accountability for the criminal acts of Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 4568. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program under which the Secretaries make payments for certain treatments of traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4569. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 relating to the amount of rental assistance available under the veterans affairs supported housing program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4570. A bill to reauthorize the United States Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 4571. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the amount available for reimbursements payable by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to State approving agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 4572. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act relating to greenhouse gases, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 4573. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Directors at the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other multilateral development institutions to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to cancel immediately and completely Haiti's debts to such institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 4574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitations on the maximum amount of the deduction of interest on education loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 4575. A bill to authorize grants for the creation, update, or adaption of open textbooks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4576. A bill to require a study and report on the feasibility and potential of establishing a deep water sea port in the Arctic to protect and advance strategic United States interests within the evolving and ever more important region; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland (for herself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.J. Res. 74. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting Congress and the States to regulate the expenditure of funds by corporations engaging in political speech; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself and Mr. BONNER):

H. Res. 1050. A resolution providing amounts for further expenses of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the One Hundred Eleventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOREN (for himself, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. COLE, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. LUCAS):

H. Res. 1052. A resolution honoring the members of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard of the State of Oklahoma for their service and sacrifice on behalf of the United States since September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DAHLKEMPER:

H. Res. 1053. A resolution recognizing that women are equally affected by colon cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Alabama:

H. Res. 1054. A resolution commending and congratulating the University of West Alabama on the occasion of its 175th anniversary;

to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H. Res. 1055. A resolution supporting the designation of National Robotics Week as an annual event; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself and Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA):

H. Res. 1056. A resolution expressing support for designation of April as National Limb Loss Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MINNICK, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Ms. WATSON):

H. Res. 1057. A resolution recognizing the National Basketball Association's (NBA) All-Star Game in the Greater Dallas Metroplex; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas):

H. Res. 1058. A resolution honoring and praising the Sojourn to the Past organization on the occasion of its 10th anniversary; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCMAHON (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SIRS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. HARE, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HIMES, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. WU, Mr. TEAGUE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. KISSELL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. KILROY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. BRALEY

of Iowa, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, and Ms. DEGETTE):

H. Res. 1059. A resolution honoring the heroism of the seven United States Agency for International Development and Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance supported urban search and rescue teams deployed to Haiti from New York City, New York, Fairfax County, Virginia, Los Angeles County, California, Miami, Florida, Miami-Dade County, Florida, and Virginia Beach, Virginia, and commending their dedication and assistance in the aftermath of the January 12, 2010 Haitian earthquake; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina):

H. Res. 1060. A resolution congratulating Frank Buckles, America's last surviving WWI veteran, on his 109th birthday on February 1, 2010; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. HELLER):

H. Res. 1061. A resolution honoring the heroic actions of Court Security Officer Stanley Cooper, Deputy United States Marshal Richard J. "Joe" Gardner, the law enforcement officers of the United States Marshals Service and Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, and the Court Security Officers in responding to the armed assault at the Lloyd D. George Federal Courthouse on January 4, 2010; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 39: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
 H.R. 208: Mr. AUSTRIA.  
 H.R. 272: Mr. CASTLE.  
 H.R. 305: Mr. KISSELL.  
 H.R. 333: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 345: Mr. CALVERT.  
 H.R. 422: Mr. POMEROY.  
 H.R. 442: Mr. BONNER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Ms. GIFFORDS.  
 H.R. 476: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. CHU.  
 H.R. 482: Mr. HODES and Mr. FALOMAVAEGA.  
 H.R. 503: Mr. SIRE.  
 H.R. 519: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 634: Mr. MELANCON.  
 H.R. 635: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 690: Mr. PETRI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 734: Mr. HONDA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.  
 H.R. 745: Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 775: Mr. COBLE.  
 H.R. 832: Ms. HIRONO.  
 H.R. 878: Mr. GRIFFITH and Ms. FOXX.  
 H.R. 1074: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. BONNER.  
 H.R. 1083: Mr. FLEMING.  
 H.R. 1126: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 1177: Mr. MASSA.  
 H.R. 1179: Mr. ROSS and Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 1215: Mr. SESTAK.  
 H.R. 1240: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
 H.R. 1310: Mr. LANCE.  
 H.R. 1326: Mr. KISSELL.  
 H.R. 1347: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1362: Mr. THORNBERRY.  
 H.R. 1526: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MELANCON, and Mr. POLIS.  
 H.R. 1552: Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. DUNCAN.  
 H.R. 1557: Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1693: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.  
 H.R. 1778: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
 H.R. 1806: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. MCINTYRE.  
 H.R. 1884: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. WALZ, and Mrs. HALVORSON.  
 H.R. 1895: Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H.R. 2016: Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H.R. 2054: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 2057: Mr. CAO and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 2067: Mr. MCMAHON and Mr. CLAY.  
 H.R. 2084: Mr. MAFFEI.  
 H.R. 2085: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 2089: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. BERKLEY.  
 H.R. 2122: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
 H.R. 2138: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.  
 H.R. 2142: Mr. MURPHY of New York and Mr. QUIGLEY.  
 H.R. 2254: Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. SOUDER.  
 H.R. 2296: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. WOLF.  
 H.R. 2342: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 2360: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN and Mr. THOMPSON of California.  
 H.R. 2408: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
 H.R. 2415: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2416: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2443: Mr. DEFazio.  
 H.R. 2478: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.  
 H.R. 2521: Mr. TIERNEY.  
 H.R. 2528: Mr. STUPAK.  
 H.R. 2546: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TANNER, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Mr. WAMP.  
 H.R. 2556: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. AKIN.  
 H.R. 2578: Mr. TOWNS.  
 H.R. 2600: Mr. WITTMAN.  
 H.R. 2616: Mr. SESTAK and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 2626: Mr. STUPAK.  
 H.R. 2672: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 2849: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HIMES, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. TITUS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FARR, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. CHU, and Ms. MATSUI.  
 H.R. 2941: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. TERRY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 3012: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H.R. 3025: Mr. MURPHY of New York.  
 H.R. 3043: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
 H.R. 3057: Mr. DEFazio.  
 H.R. 3077: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 3101: Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 3212: Mr. LEE of New York.  
 H.R. 3257: Mr. JONES.  
 H.R. 3308: Mr. JONES.  
 H.R. 3431: Mr. CASSIDY.  
 H.R. 3485: Mr. LEE of New York.  
 H.R. 3519: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 3554: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. TONKO.  
 H.R. 3560: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 3562: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 3652: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
 H.R. 3682: Mr. SESTAK.  
 H.R. 3695: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 3712: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. OWENS.  
 H.R. 3715: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. OWENS.  
 H.R. 3734: Mr. KLEIN of Florida and Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 3758: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and Mr. CHANDLER.  
 H.R. 3764: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
 H.R. 3777: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 3790: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
 H.R. 3926: Mr. TERRY.  
 H.R. 3943: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. EHLERS, and Ms. CHU.  
 H.R. 3974: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 4014: Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MELANCON, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.  
 H.R. 4036: Mr. TONKO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WU.  
 H.R. 4043: Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 4051: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. PIERLUISI.  
 H.R. 4091: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.  
 H.R. 4098: Mr. WELCH, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MELANCON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. BARROW, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. FOSTER.  
 H.R. 4123: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. MURPHY of New York.  
 H.R. 4127: Mr. TIAHRT.  
 H.R. 4140: Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 4149: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 4163: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 4177: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 4183: Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 4196: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. MASSA.  
 H.R. 4197: Ms. GIFFORDS.  
 H.R. 4202: Mr. HOLT and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 4241: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 4247: Mr. TONKO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. CHU.  
 H.R. 4255: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DENT, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. BOSWELL.  
 H.R. 4256: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. HIGGINS.  
 H.R. 4262: Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
 H.R. 4269: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WEINER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
 H.R. 4278: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 4279: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. MURPHY of New York.  
 H.R. 4295: Mr. CARNAHAN.  
 H.R. 4296: Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. TOWNS.  
 H.R. 4298: Mr. FARR, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
 H.R. 4321: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 4324: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. OWENS.  
 H.R. 4343: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WATSON, and Ms. RICHARDSON.  
 H.R. 4359: Mr. MASSA and Mr. COSTA.  
 H.R. 4373: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
 H.R. 4378: Mr. KLEIN of Florida and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 4386: Mr. COHEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. HIRONO.  
 H.R. 4393: Mr. BACA.  
 H.R. 4394: Mr. WELCH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. ELLISON.



H.R. 4400: Mr. WELCH, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. JONES, Mr. WATT, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 4403: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4404: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4405: Mr. WU, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. STARK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4415: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 4426: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 4427: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 4453: Mr. CAMP and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 4459: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 4463: Mr. TERRY, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 4475: Mr. TEAGUE.

H.R. 4490: Mr. LATTA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. HELLER.

H.R. 4496: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 4503: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 4505: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. OLSON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 4521: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 4522: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 4527: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. SUTTON.

H.R. 4530: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 4534: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 4537: Mr. WEINER and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 4538: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FARR, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 4542: Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 4544: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. SPEIER.

H. Con. Res. 170: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 226: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. BUYER.

H. Con. Res. 227: Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WATT, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 230: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 101: Mr. ELLSWORTH.

H. Res. 111: Mr. LEE of New York and Mr. SABLAN.

H. Res. 267: Ms. ESHOO.

H. Res. 274: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H. Res. 330: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H. Res. 440: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. KISSELL.

H. Res. 633: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 704: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COLE, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, and Mr. TONKO.

H. Res. 716: Mrs. MALONEY.

H. Res. 803: Mrs. EMERSON.

H. Res. 847: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H. Res. 872: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 898: Mr. HEINRICH.

H. Res. 925: Mr. WU.

H. Res. 929: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 957: Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H. Res. 959: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H. Res. 975: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H. Res. 977: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H. Res. 996: Mr. TONKO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. OLVER, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 1014: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H. Res. 1032: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. INGLIS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 1034: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. STEARNS.

H. Res. 1040: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. NYE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. KIND, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Res. 1044: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H. Res. 1046: Mr. SNYDER, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. BACA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WU, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. CAO, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.